IBN KHALDŪN
HIS LIFE AND WORK

Translated from the Arabic

IBN KHALDUN

HIS LIFE AND WORK

By

MUHAMMAD ABDULLAH ENAN

(Formerly of the Egyptian Bar)
Assistant Director of Press Department
Ministry of the Interior, Cairo

★

1941

Sh. MUHAMMAD ASHRAF

KASHMIRI BAZAR - LAHORE (India)

FOREWORD

THE intellectual legacy of Ibn Khaldun is unique among the works of Moslem thought and, notwithstanding the lapse of centuries, still maintains its value, vigour and modernity, and occupies a high place among the monuments of world thought. But Ibn Khaldun, whom the West discovered and, for more than a century, studied, criticized and analysed his works, is not fully appreciated in the East; his memory is forgotton and his legacy is cast into oblivion; while in the West various books and critical studies have been written about the man and his work, there has almost been nothing of the sort in the East, his home and the owner of his patrimony.

It is gratifying to note, however, that Ibn Khaldun has lately been spoken of and an appeal made to revive his memory on the occasion of the six hundredth anniversary of his birth.* Intellectual and literary circles in all the Arabic-speaking countries responded to this generous appeal, several meetings were held to evoke his memory and his immortal

* This was in 1932.

works, particularly in Tunis, his birthplace, and the cradle of his fame, and in Egypt the home of his old age and his last resting place. The Arabic press was for some time busy with publishing studies about him, thus vividly evoking his memory and directing attention to his legacy.

As Ibn Khaldun was foremost among the Moslem thinkers, I knew and studied him in my younger days. He deeply impressed me as being the foremost among the historians whose comprehension of history, its value and criticism, I greatly admired. This study, which I present to introduce Ibn Khaldun and his legacy, is a token of the gratitude of a disciple to his master; the six hundredth anniversary of the birth of the great historian and philosopher was an available occasion for writing this study.

I have carefully followed the life of Ibn Khaldun closely and have explained the political events in which he took part and with which he was connected. As his life formed part of the history of the Berber states in the middle of the eighth century A.H., I have dealt at greater length on the history of these states and the changes which took place in them at that time, and have tried to explain their political institutions. Likewise I have taken great interest in the life of Ibn Khaldun in Egypt, and

dealt at great length with it, explaining the relations of the historian with the intellectual Egyptian society, and the controversy between him and the Egyptian writers.

As for the legacy of Ibn Khaldun, I propose to give a simple exposition and to avoid polemics and complicated comparisons, being careful at the same time to review points of interest and useful discussion. My object is to present in a clear concise manner the legacy of Ibn Khaldun to the cultured youth, so that when they understand and appreciate it they can take up Ibn Khaldun's work, read and study it carefully and fully. As for the study of Western research of Ibn Khaldun, and its appreciation, analysis and comparison of his thoughts and theories, I have reserved a special chapter giving a complete purport of all that has been written on the subject.

I have likewise given a bibliographical note of "Kitab al-Ibar" showing the phases through which it passed till it was completely published, the manuscripts consulted, the parts translated into European languages, and the manuscript copies of it in the various libraries. This is followed by a detailed explanation of all the Arabic and Western sources I consulted, in which Ibn Khaldun and his legacy are studied, to be read by those who wish to go

deeper into the subject.

Although an ancient thinker Ibn Khaldun should be a master to the youth of Arabic and Islamic world, and his Prolegomena should be often read by them, not only to admire his marvellous thought and research, but also to learn from it the methods of expression of many social theories, which otherwise are difficult to express, because if the Prolegomena of Ibn Khaldun is an inestimable wealth in the intellectual legacy of Arabic literature, it is also an inestimable wealth of Arabic rhetoric.

I present to the cultured youth in all Arabic and Moslem countries this study of a distinguished personality in Moslem thought, a great original spirit who anticipated the West in laying down the principles of sociology and is still the object of admiration and appreciation by Western research, hoping that the youth will find in this study an incentive to read, understand and profit by the valuable legacy of Ibn Khaldun.

Cairo, October 1933.

M.A. ENAN.

CONTENTS

Book I

THE LIFE OF IBN KHALDUN

Book II

THE INTELLECTUAL AND SOCIAL LEGACY OF IBN KHALDUN

BOOK I

THE LIFE OF IBN KHALDUN

PART I

In North Africa and Andalusia
732-784 A.H., 1332-1382 A.D.

CHAPTER I

The Early Life of Ibn Khaldun

Banu Khaldun, their origin in Andalusia and their predominance in public life. Their emigration to North Africa. Muhammad ibn Khaldun, the historian's father. The childhood of Ibn Khaldun and early studies Death of his family and friends in the great plague. His appointment to the post of Seal Bearer in the court of Tunis.

THE year 1932 inspired an immortal memory of Islamic thought. It was the six hundredth anniversary of the birth of Ibn Khaldun, the historian, politician and social philosopher. As the works of this great thinker occupy a most important place in the legacy of Arabic thought, it is fit and proper that this memory should be an occasion to study his life and works, as, notwithstanding his great fame, neither his life nor his works, though valuable and original, have received from our contemporary thought the attention and criticism they are worthy of.

Ibn Khaldun has left us his own biography. He recorded with his own pen the events of his life from his childhood almost to the close of his life. He represented for us much of his character

and psychological disposition, so that we at first think, in reading this exhaustive autobiography of the historian, that he did not leave to his biographer an occasion for much thought and that his task would be confined to reproduction. There is much truth in this supposition, for Ibn Khaldun is the most fertile and important of our sources in all that concerns his life and the events of his age. But the task of the modern biographer is not merely to record events. Even if there is no necessity to verify facts, there is always the question of appreciation and moral deduction as well as the difference in the various points of view. If Ibn Khaldun gives us his biography and the events of his age connected with his life, he narrates them according to his own comprehension and point of view. He might have been often partial or influenced by his sentiments. To find out the truth through all these factors is a difficult task. If therefore we welcome this autobiography of the historian, and if it facilitates the task of his biographer, we feel, on the other hand, in a difficult position on many occasions where we notice traces of sentiments or partiality.

The legacy of the historian is thus the principal source for his biography. But happily it is not our only source; there are other sources and biographies

worthy of investigation, particularly about his life in Egypt; these we shall consult too. We shall follow the phases of his life through all this legacy, but we shall try to understand them in the light of naked truth, apart from influences and passions.

I

Ibn Khaldun was born in Tunis on Ramadan 1, 732 A.H. (May 27, 1332 A.D.) and belonged to an Andalusian family which had emigrated from Andalusia (Moslem Spain) to Tunis in the middle of the seventh century of the Hijira. He is Wali-al-Din Abd al-Rahman, son of Muhammad, son of Muhammad, son of Muhammad, son of Al-Hassan, son of Jabir, son of Muhammad, son of Ibrahim, son of Abd al-Rahman ibn Khaldun. Ibn Khaldun attributes his origin to the Yemenite Arabs of Hadramaut, and his genealogy to Wail ibn Hajar, relying for this on the report of the Andalusian genealogist Ibn Hazm.* He, however, doubts the authenticity of this genealogical tree and believes that many names were left out of it, for if Khaldun was his grandfather who entered

* Ibn Hazm died in 457 A.H., 1065 A.D.

Andalusia at the time of the Arab conquest, ten grandfathers would not be enough to cover the six-and-a-half centuries which elapsed from the conquest to his birth. In his opinion it needed twenty at the rate of three grandfathers per century. As for the genealogy of his grandfather Khaldun, who was the first to enter Andalusia, he is, as also reported by Ibn Hazm, Khalid known by the name of Khaldun, son of Osman, son of Hani, son of Al-Khattab, son of Kuraib, son of Maadi Karab, son of Al-Haris, son of Wail, son of Hajar. Thus, according to this genealogy, Ibn Khaldun is a scion of one of the oldest Arab Yemenite tribes. But there is reason to doubt the authenticity of this distant genealogy recorded by Ibn Hazm for the first time in the fifth century of the Hijira, and this doubt is strengthened by our knowledge of the circumstances of antagonism and rivalry between the Arabs and the Berbers in Andalusia. The Berbers took part in the conquest of Andalusia and bore the greatest brunt, while the Arabs alone enjoyed authority and rule. This antagonism lasted very long till the Arab racial predominance declined and the Berbers began to dominate in the early part of the fifth century. To be of Arab origin was considered, in Andalusia, a coveted honour on account of their dominance and influence.

But doubt entered into the genealogies of many chiefs and racial leaders; indeed, it found its way into the genealogies of many principal conquerors. It was said of Tarik ibn Ziyad that he was a Berber, a Persian, or a *mawla* (slave) of the Arabs. Here is, however, reason to wonder at the attachment of Ibn Khaldun to his Arab origin, for, in his Prolegomena, he shows strong antagonism and prejudice to the Arabs, while in another part of his history he praises the Berbers and extols their character and qualities.

In any case Ibn Khaldun belonged to a prominent, influential family of Andalusia which goes back to the age of conquest. His great-grandfather Khalid, known by the name of Khaldun, entered Andalusia with the Yemenite troops and at first settled in the town of Caramona where he founded his family. His descendants then moved to Seville, but Banu Khaldun appeared on the scene of events only at the end of the third century during the reign of Emir Abdulla ibn Muhammad, the Omayyad (274-300 A.H.), in whose days Andalusia was raging with dissension and revolution extending over many parts of the country. Seville was foremost among the rebellious cities, where Umayya ibn Abd al-Ghafir, Abdulla ibn al-Hajjaj and Kuraib and Khalid, sons of Khaldun, all of

whom were chiefs of great families, raised the standard of revolt. Umayya was the governor of the city under Emir Muhammad. He rebelled and assumed absolute power and killed Ibn al-Hajjaj, but the families of Khaldun and of Al-Hajjaj rose against him, severely opposed him and fought him till he was killed. Kuraib ibn Khaldun assumed absolute authority and declared himself ruler of the principality of Seville. But the family of Al-Hajjaj rose against him, and their leader Ibrahim became the ally of Ibn Hafsun, who was at that time the greatest rebel of Andalusia and had conquered its southern part between Malaga and Ronda. Kuraib apprehended him and associated him in the government of Seville. Kuraib being severe and cruel was disliked by the inhabitants of Seville who sided with Ibrahim for his kindness and leniency. Ibrahim approached Emir Abdulla and secretly obtained from him a decree making him ruler of Seville. He then led the inhabitants of the city against Kuraib and killed him, and made himself sole Emir and so became powerful. Banu Khaldun continued to live in Seville during the whole of the Omayyad rule without, however, obtaining prominence till the days of the Petty Kings (Al-Tawaif) and the conquest of Seville by Ibn Abbad. It was then that the star of the family

again rose and attained the vizierate and other high posts under Banu Abbad, and its chiefs witnessed the famous battle of Zallaka in which Ibn Abbad and his ally Yousuf ibn Tashfin, the Almoravide, defeated Alphonso VI, King of Castille (479 A.H., 1086 A.D.) and some of them fell in that battle. Then came the speedy downfall of the Petty Kings, and the Almoravides ruled over the Moslem Spain for a time. The Almohades then rose in Mauritania and wrenched Andalusia from the Almoravides and appointed their chiefs rulers of its provinces and cities, when Abu Hafs, leader of the Hintata tribe, became ruler of Seville and Western Andalusia and was succeeded by his sons. Banu Khaldun came in touch with the new rulers and restored some of their old authority.

When the empire of the Almohades declined and the affairs of Andalusia were disturbed and its principal cities and ports withered and fell one after the other into the hands of the King of Castille, Emir Abu Zakaria al-Hafsi, grandson of Abu Hafs, emigrated to Tunis in the year 620 A.H. (1223 A.D.), cast away the authority of the Almohades, sons of Abd al-Momin, and declared himself an independent ruler. Banu Khaldun, apprehending evil consequences, left Seville before it fell into the hands of the Christians and settled

for a time in Ceuta where its governor, a Hafsite, welcomed them. The then head of the family, Al-Hassan ibn Muhammad ibn Khaldun, the fourth grandfather of the historian, followed Abu Zakaria, the Emir of Bona where he enjoyed his patronage and munificence. On his death Emir Zakaria was succeeded by his son Al-Mustansir, then by his son Yahia and later by his brother Abu Ishaq. In the meantime Banu Khaldun enjoyed authority and opulence. In the days of Abu Ishaq, Abu Bakr Muhammad ibn Khaldun, the historian's great-grandfather, was appointed minister, and his son Muhammad chamberlain for a time to Abu Farsi, son and crown prince of Abu Ishaq, who at that time was the independent ruler of Bougie. Later the authority of Banu Hafs was shaken, and a leader named Ibn Abi Emara revolted and occupied Tunis and arrested Abu Bakr ibn Khaldun, murdered him and confiscated his property. His son Muhammad remained at the court of Bougie, and took part in the combats then raging between Banu Hafs and the rebels and occupied various posts under Banu Hafs. The chief of the Almohades, Emir Abu Yahia al-Lihyani, then conquered Tunis in the year 711 A.H. and appointed him chamberlain for a time. He then retired from public life, but he maintained his position and

influence in the state till he died in 737 A.H. (1337 A.D.) As for his son Muhammad, the historian's father, he had no taste for politics and preferred a life of study, excelling in jurisprudence, philology and poetry. He died in the great plague in 749 A.H. (1349 A.D.) leaving several children: Abu Zaid Wali al-Din, the historian, then a youth of eighteen, Omar, Musa, Yahia, and Muhammad, the eldest of them. Besides the historian, only Yahia, who later became minister, was prominent.

II

Ibn Khaldun was thus the descendant of an old, prominent and learned family. He was brought up in the cradle of this legacy which he inherited from his family, guided by its fortunes and traditions. He was bred in the lap of his father who was his first teacher. He read the Qur-an and learned it by heart, and studied modes of recitation and interpretation, as well as the Hadith and jurisprudence. He was taught grammar and rhetoric by the most noted professors of Tunis which was at that time the centre of science and literature in North Africa*

* We mean here North Africa with the exception of Egypt.

and the home of a number of Andalusian scholars who were dispersed by events or found their country inhospitable. Ibn Khaldun gives us the names of his teachers in every branch of science, and fully describes their lives and qualities. He also mentions the names of some of the books he studied, and it appears from his writings that he specialized to a certain extent in the Hadith and Maliki jurisprudence, philology and poetry.* He then studied logic and philosophy in the course of his public life, and refers to his proficiency in both of them.† "All his teachers acknowledged his abilities and gave him their Ijaza."‡

Ibn Khaldun continued his studies till he attained the age of eighteen. It was then that North Africa was afflicted with that great catastrophe which befell the whole of the Moslem world from Samarkand to Mauritania—we mean the Great Plague or the "sweeping plague", as it is called by Ibn Khaldun. It was the same epidemic that raged in Italy and most of the European countries, and described by Boccacio, an eye-witness, in the most vivid colour. In this calamity which befell the East and the

* See Ibn Khaldun's Autobiography *(Al-Taarif) Kitab al-Ibar* (Bulak), Vol VII, pp 384-85

† *Kitab al-Ibar*, Vol VII, pp 386 and 391.

‡ The *Ijaza* is a sort of certificate or diploma given by the Shaikh (Professor) to his students.

West in 1349 A.D. (749 A.H.) the historian lost both his parents and all his professors, and most of the inhabitants of Tunis died. Ibn Khaldun refers more than once, in touching terms, to this calamity, and says: " It folded the carpet with all there was on it," and " the notables, the leaders and all the learned died, as well as my parents on whom be God's mercy." He then says that he was so aggrieved by the loss of his family and teachers that he found it hard to continue to study, so he decided to emigrate to Mauritania where some of the professors and friends had gone, but was dissuaded by his eldest brother Muhammad. Not long after, he had the occasion to enter into public life, when Abu Muhammad ibn Tafrakin, the tyrant of Tunis, summoned him to fill the post of the Seal Bearer to the young Sultan Abu Ishaq who was then his captive. The Seal Bearer (Secretary of Al-Alama) had to affix the name and the cypher of the Sultan on the royal correspondence and decrees. The historian was at that time a youth under twenty.

CHAPTER II

Ibn Khaldun at the Court of Fez

Political organization of Africa in the eighth century A H. Banu Hafs, *Banu Abd al-Wad and Banu Mareen Sultan Abul Hassan and his conquest of Tunis* Conditions of the states and courts of North Africa. *The effect of political developments on the intellectual movement.* Ibn Khaldun's flight from Tunis. His introduction to Sultan Abu Enan, King of Morocco His appointment to the post of Secretary and Seal Bearer His ambition and aspirations His participation in court intrigues He was accused of conspiring. Imprisonment and adversity. His release by the Vizier Hassan ibn Omar, and restoration to his former posts He seized the opportunity and turned against Vizier ibn Omar. His propaganda in favour of Sultan Abu Salem , and conspiracy against Sultan Mansur The accession of Abu Salem The appointment of Ibn Khaldun to the post of secretary Poems and prose of Ibn Khaldun His appointment to the post of principal judge The downfall and murder of Abu Salem The domination of Vizier Omar ibn Abdulla and Ibn Khaldun supporting him Misunderstanding between him and the Vizier His decision to emigrate to Andalusia

I

BEFORE following the historian in the phases of his public life and movements in the states and courts of North Africa, we would say a few words about the conditions of these states and courts.

North Africa was at the close of the seventh century of the Hijira the theatre of violent political revolutions. The empire of the Almohades broke down, and on its ruins rose several small states and principalities. There arose in Tunis the Emirate of Banu Hafs, in Tlemcen and in the Middle Barbary (Algeria) the Emirate of Banu Abd al-Wad, in Fez and Morocco the Kingdom of Banu Mareen. There also arose under the auspices of these kingdoms and beyond them small principalities in some cities and ports through strong rebels and leaders. The greater portion in the heritage of Almohades fell to Banu Mareen (the Merinites) whose kingdom was the largest and most powerful, comprising Mauritania (Morocco), Ceuta, a part of Middle Barbary and sometimes Gibraltar. Their leader and the founder of their dynasty was Sultan Abu Yousuf Yacoub ibn Abd al-Haq who invaded Andalusia more than once, and died in 685 A.H. (1286 A.D.). He was succeeded on the throne by several powerful kings. At the time we speak of, Sultan Abul Hassan sat on the throne of Fez. He succeeded to the throne on the death of his father Sultan Abu Sa'eed in 731 A.H. (1330 A.D.). He was ambitious and had great projects. In 733 A.H. he invaded Gibraltar and wrenched it from the Christians. He then marched to Middle Barbary,

and conquered its ports one after the other from the hands of Banu Abd al-Wad till he occupied Tlemcen the seat of their realm in 737 A.H. Thus the kingdom of Banu Mareen extended to the east as far as the frontiers of Tunis. Sultan Abul Hassan then planned to conquer Tunis from Banu Hafs, their relatives and friends. He marched to it in the beginning of 748 A.H. after appointing his son, Sultan Abu Enan, ruler of the Middle Barbary. He wrenched Tunis from the hands of its king, Omar ibn Abi Yahia, and spent two years there settling its affairs. But during his absence insurrection broke out in Morocco and many ports rebelled against him. When he heard that his son Sultan Abu Enan intended to usurp the throne, he appointed his son Al-Fadl ruler of Tunis and left for Morocco in 750 A.H. In the meantime Banu Hafs prepared to reconquer their country and were helped by the ports which acknowledged their authority. As soon as Abul Hassan left Tunis Maulai al-Fadl, son of Sultan Abu Yahia, marched and took possession of it and restored the authority of his family. Not long after, Vizier ibn Tafrakin rebelled and usurped the throne from him and appointed his young brother Abu Ishaq King under his patronage and tyrannical regency. This was in 751 A.H.

Such were the conditions of the North African

states in the middle of the eighth century of the Hijira. Revolutions and political upheavals were continuous, and kingdoms succeeded one another, through different usurpers and dynasties. There arose successive small principalities in the middle cities and ports, as Bougie, Constantine, Bona and Tlemcen with endless battles to conquer them. All the thrones of North Africa trembled in the hands of fate, and thus their courts were the seats of ambition and rivalry, the centres of intrigues and plots and the goal of the chiefs and rivals seeking supremacy and power. Thrones and Emirates were constantly changing and wars and civil combats constantly raged between dynasties or branches of the same dynasty. Yet those disturbed courts flourished in the few intervals of peace and vied with each other in splendour and luxury and attracted intellectual and literary men. Banu Hafs and Banu Mareen were particularly the protectors of scholars and men of letters who gathered around them enjoying their patronage and munificence and occupying posts of influence and confidence. It is to be remarked in the history of North Africa, in this interval, that the intellectual movement flourished, settled and moved according to the conditions and vicissitudes of these states, and, like the states, was always disturbed and unsettled, and that no sooner

it gathered round a certain palace than it hastened to another when it began to decay. As the intellectual movement in North Africa, at that time, always gathered and moved round its states and courts, it likewise moved constantly between North Africa and Moslem Spain. Granada was still the cradle of a brilliant intellectual movement, but Andalusia was too crowded with its scholars and men of letters particularly as the Christian kingdom of Castille had deprived it of some of its provinces, and conquered most of its ports and towns. It was for this reason that many Andalusian scholars and men of letters emigrated to North Africa which offered greater possibilities, more security and where it was easier to earn a livelihood.

It was in these conditions that Ibn Khaldun began his public life. Since their emigration to Africa, in the middle of the seventh century A.H., Banu Khaldun enjoyed the patronage of Banu Hafs and occupied posts of honour and influence. But the Hafsite dynasty was at that time declining, and the family of the historian lost much of its former influence and riches. Ibn Khaldun naturally aspired to restore the legacy of his family and revive its declining influence. The head of the young man was no doubt full of ambition and projects and he availed himself of the first opportunity

to enter the field of public life when Ibn Tafrakin summoned him, as already stated, to fill the post of the Seal Bearer to his captive Sultan Abu Ishaq about the end of 751 A.H. (1350 A.D.). But Ibn Khaldun apprehended the weakness of the government of Tunis and its disturbed condition. Banu Mareen had occupied Tunis for two years, as already mentioned, and Ibn Khaldun witnessed their power and the greatness of their empire. When Sultan Abul Hassan left Tunis for Morocco, most of the intellectuals who were professors and colleagues of Ibn Khaldun followed his suite, preferring to seek their fortune under the patronage of this strong, victorious kingdom and hoping to acquire honour and riches which could no more be realized in Tunis. Such an aspiration filled the soul of the historian, but his elder brother dissuaded him for a time. When he was summoned to be the Seal Bearer, he watched for an opportunity to emigrate to Morocco to seek his fortune and try to realize his ambitions wherever the horizon of adventure seemed wider and more advantageous.

II

It was not long before this opportunity came. Early in 753 A.H. the Emir of Constantine, Abu Zaid, the grandson of Sultan Yahia, marched with his forces to Tunis to conquer it and restore the legacy of his family from the grasp of the usurping minister Ibn Tafrakin. Ibn Tafrakin marched to meet him and was accompanied by Ibn Khaldun. Several combats were fought in which the army of Tunis was defeated, and Ibn Khaldun secretly withdrew from the vanquished camp seeking safety. He lived for a time with some Almoravide shaikhs in Aba. He then went to Ceuta and afterwards returned to Cafsa where he was joined by some *faqihs* of Tunis which was then besieged by the Emir of Constantine. From there he accompanied them to Biskra where he passed the winter season.

Meanwhile Sultan Abul Hassan, King of Morocco died (Rabi II, 752 A.H.) shortly after the revolt of his son Sultan Abu Enan against him and his occupation of Fez. Abu Enan was a powerful, determined prince. No sooner he settled on the throne of his father than he began to make preparations to conquer Middle Barbary (Algeria) and recapture

Tlemcen which his father had conquered from Banu Abd al-Wad but retaken by them a few years later. He marched on it early in 753 A.H., conquered it and killed its King Abu Sa'eed. He then took possession of Bougie through the submission of its ruler. At that time Ibn Khaldun who was in Biskra went to meet Sultan Abu Enan in Tlemcen. The historian tells us that the Sultan honoured him more than he had expected, and sent him back with his chamberlain Ibn Abi Amr to Bougie where he witnessed the enthronement and submission of the city. When the chamberlain returned to the Sultan, accompanied by many delegations, Ibn Khaldun went with them and was received again and honoured by the Sultan. The Sultan then returned to Fez, the capital of his realm, and Ibn Khaldun with Ibn Abi Amr returned to Bougie and remained with him to the close of the year 754 A.H. (1353 A.D.).

Ibn Khaldun joined the suit of Sultan Abu Enan very soon. He tells us that it was the Sultan who summoned him when his name was mentioned in a meeting held to choose the ulama (scholars). He arrived in Fez in the year 755 A.H. and was appointed by the Sultan member of his academy (Council of Ulama), and was ordered to attend prayers with him. The Sultan continued to promote him till he

was appointed one of his secretaries and seal bearers. But Ibn Khaldun tells us that he accepted this post unwillingly, because it was not among the posts occupied by his ancestors; in other words, because it was inferior to them in dignity and importance, which proves the ambitions which filled the mind of the historian in spite of his youth. He was, however, able to resume his studies, during his sojourn in Fez, with some of the principal scholars who came from Andalusia and other cities of North Africa. There is no doubt that he learned much in that interval and that his knowledge considerably increased.

From that time on Ibn Khaldun became an outstanding personality in the history of the states of North Africa, actively participating in the evolutions of these states and their vicissitudes, at one time taking part in preparing the causes of their rise or downfall, at others kindling between them the fire of rivalry, intrigue and war.

Ibn Khaldun was at that time a young man of twenty-two, but his intelligence, force of character, determination, great ambitions and his pride of being the scion of a prominent family, always incited him to seek more authority, influence and riches. The conditions of the states and courts of North Africa at that time opened the road to prominence

before able, determined men. The relations of Ibn Khaldun with Sultan Abu Enan, who was the greatest monarch of North Africa, and his position in that flourishing court paved the way for his rise, were the beginning of that great political activity which, for about thirty years, carried him from one state to another and from one palace to another, some times to fame and some times to downfall, some times to riches and others to adversity.

Two years after the appointment of Ibn Khaldun to the court of Fez his ambitious spirit moved him to engage in political intrigues. Although his master and patron, Sultan Abu Enan, continued to honour and cover him with his favours, as he admits, and although he appointed him to the post of Secretary in spite of his youth, and admitted him as member of his private council and authorized him to sign for him, he did not hesitate to conspire against him with Emir Abu Abdulla Muhammad, the dethroned ruler of Bougie who was then a captive in Fez. Ibn Khaldun tells us the story of this conspiracy in obscure words, and acknowledges that there was an understanding between him and the imprisoned Emir of Bougie in which he exceeded the limits of reserve. But his excuse is that he was induced to do so by the old friendship between his family and Banu Hafs to which the deposed Emir

belonged. Sultan Abu Enan was at that time ill, but when he heard of this conspiracy that Ibn Khaldun was trying to help the Emir of Bougie to escape and restore his throne and then appoint him chamberlain in case of success, he ordered him to be arrested and put into prison. Although he later released the Emir of Bougie, he kept the historian chained in prison. This adversity, which Ibn Khaldun attributes to the intrigues of his enemies, befell him early in 758 A.H. (1357 A.D.).

Ibn Khaldun remained two long years in prison. He often prayed Sultan Abu Enan to release him but the Sultan ignored all supplications; he finally submitted to him an ode of about two hundred verses imploring for mercy, of which the following is a specimen:

> How can I remonstrate with time,
> And which vicissitudes of fortune can I fight?
> I am submitting to the judgment of fate,
> Which at one time is favourable and at another
> antagonistic.

Ibn Khaldun tells us that his ode was favourably received by the Sultan. Abu Enan who was in Tlemcen promised to release him, but the illness from which he suffered was aggravated and he died before fulfilling his promise in the month of Zil-Hijja, 759 A.H. (1358 A.D.). Vizier Al-Hassan ibn

Omar, who was acting regent, ordered him and other prisoners to be released and to be restored to his former post and covered him with his favour.

III

When Sultan Abu Enan died, Vizier Al-Hassan ibn Omar opposed the accession of his son and heir Abu Zayan and placed his own infant son Al-Sa'eed on the throne. He assumed absolute power and murdered the other rival ministers. When Abu Enan wrenched the throne from his father, he had arrested his brother Mawla Abu Salem and deported him with his other brothers to Andalusia. On the death of Abu Enan Abu Salem tried to recapture his throne. Not without great difficulty he crossed to Morocco and went to the mountains of Ghomara and declared himself King. The tribes of Ghomara joined and supported him. At the same time there was a new upheaval in Fez. Mansur ibn Sulaiman, a descendant of Yacoub ibn Abd al-Haq, revolted against Vizier Al-Hassan and wrenched the power from him. The Vizier and his Sultan, Al-Sa'eed, hid themselves in the city, but were besieged by Al-Mansur. In these events Ibn Khaldun found an opportunity for action

and prominence, and behaved in an uncreditable manner. His conduct against Sultan Abu Enan was an evil sign revealing wicked feelings and passions. This act was not, however, due to a temporary mistake; on the contrary, it indicated a tendency rooted in his soul and was the fruit of a conviction. Ibn Khaldun was an opportunist; he seized opportunities using all means and manners, and to him the end justified the means. He did not hesitate to return evil for good. He plainly explains this tendency and does not try to conceal it. Vizier Ibn Omar released him from prison, covered him with his favours, but no sooner he saw the rise of the victorious Mansur than he abandoned the Vizier and sided with his adversary, and occupied the post of secretary to the new King. But his loyalty did not last long, because Sultan Abu Salem arrived in Ghomara and began to proclaim himself King. His envoy, Al-Faqih ibn Marzuk, got in touch secretly with Ibn Khaldun, and handed him a letter from Abu Salem begging him to make propaganda in his favour and to pave the way for his return, promising him with the best recompense. Ibn Khaldun accomplished the mission and aroused the leaders and shaikhs who responded to the appeal of Abu Salem and agreed to support him. The Vizier, Ibn Omar, likewise agreed to obey him,

having been exhausted by the siege. Ibn Khaldun suddenly left his master, accompanied by a number of leaders, and arrived at the camp of Sultan Abu Salem, and submitted his plan to dethrone Mansur ibn Sulaiman. Here Ibn Khaldun defends his conduct and declares that he abandoned Mansur for his disturbed condition and the inevitable success of the Sultan.* Abu Salem went with his forces accompanied by Ibn Khaldun to Fez. On his arrival Mansur ibn Sulaiman took to flight, and Abu Salem sat on the throne of his father (Shaban, 760 A.H.) and appointed Ibn Khaldun his secretary and made him the object of his confidence. Ibn Khaldun says that he adopted a new style in the correspondence which he freed from rhyme, then usual in writing, and replaced it with an easy flowing style and that his poetic faculty developed in this interval so that he composed many odes varying in excellence. He recited to the Sultan on various occasions many of his poems; one of the best, composed at the time, was a long ode he submitted to the Sultan on the eve of the Prophet's birthday (763 A.H.), enumerating the Prophet's qualities and miracles and eulogizing the Sultan. The ode begins:

> They cruelly abandoned and tortured me
> And kept me long weeping and lamenting,

* *Kitab al-Ibar*, Vol. VII, p. 305.

On the day of parting they refused to allow a moment
To a sad lover to say farewell.
O for the days of those parting; they left
My beating heart burning with love.
Their procession disappeared, and my tears were flowing.

In 762 A.H. when the Sultan received presents from the King of Sudan, among which was a giraffe, Ibn Khaldun submitted to the Sultan another poem eulogizing his reign and describing the giraffe in a very artistic style.

It seems that this interval was, for Ibn Khaldun, the stage of rhetoric and poetry. His prose and verse were then noted in literary circles in North Africa and Andalusia. Ibn al-Khatib described his prose and the royal letters he wrote as "channels of rhetoric, gardens of art, precious metals cleverly shaped, the prologues are similar to the epilogues in fertility of imagination and fluency of expression". As for his verse, he says that "he created a new movement in poetry and criticized it according to style; inspiration flowed upon him; he overcame every difficulty and gave us wonders".*

It is to be observed that the verse of Ibn Khaldun

* Ibn al-Khatib in his biography of Ibn Khaldun in *Al-Ihata fi Akhbar Gharnata*, quoted by Al-Makkari in *Naf h al-Tib* (Bulak), Vol. IV, p. 414 and the following

seems to be tinted with some mysticism, and that, in many of his odes, he adopts the manner of the mystic (Sufi) poets in dealing with spiritual love. It seems that Ibn Khaldun had a strong mystic tendency, and that from what he said in the Prolegomena about mysticism and the abandonment of the soul of all worldly considerations, and aspiring towards the supreme divinity,* he sufficiently studied mysticism (Sufism) and its characteristics. In the course of our narrative we quote specimens of Ibn Khaldun's verse as given in his autobiography. As for the letters he wrote for the Sultan he gives us no specimens. He, however, gives us some of his private letters addressed to Ibn al-Khatib which exhibit his power of expression and ability in prose.† He exhibits the same ability of expression in his Prolegomena and his History.

Ibn Khaldun was for about two years secretary and chamberlain to Sultan Abu Salem. He was then appointed Chief Justice, in which post he exhibited great ability. But he began to lose the Sultan's favour, and his influence waned, owing to constant rivalry between him and the high officials. Al-Faqih ibn Marzuk who was the Sultan's friend and companion in exile, enjoyed his favour and

* *Prolegomena*, pp. 390-427.

† See *Kitab al-Ibar*, Vol. VII, pp. 427 and 434.

exercised absolute influence and controlled the affairs of the state, according to his own wishes. This absolute authority annoyed the high officials and chiefs, and disturbed their relations with the Sultan. Ibn Khaldun was one of those whose favour and influence Ibn Marzuk tried to weaken, and he often intrigued against him on account of jealousy and fear of his influence. Ibn Marzuk continued in his tyranny till a tempest of indignation against him and the Sultan finally raged, and the chiefs and notables agreed to revolt. Their leader was the Vizier Omar ibn Abdulla, the Sultans brother-in-law, whose father Vizier Abdulla ibn Ali had previously held by his influence and wealth a prominent position in the court of Banu Mareen. When he died in the year 760 A.H., when Sultan Abu Salem ascended the throne, the son aspired after his father's legacy and sought the help of Ibn Marzuk to realize his ambition. The Sultan married him to his sister and appointed him grand chamberlain; thus he became for a time the object of his confidence. But this monopoly of Ibn Marzuk of the affairs of the state filled him with hatred and indignation. On the other hand, the Sultan doubted his relations with the Emir of Tlemcen and thought that they were both conspiring against him, so that he intended more than once to crush him. When

Ibn Marzuk's tyranny surpassed all bounds, and the idea of revolt was decided upon, Omar ibn Abdulla in agreement with the commander of the troops attacked the royal palace in the absence of the Sultan, captured the new capital (Al-Balad al-Jadid), and declared the dethronement of Abu Salem and the accession of his brother Tashfin in his place. The fires of revolution were kindled everywhere and the royal treasury was looted. Abu Salem tried to attack the insurgents and to recapture his throne, but when he found that his friend had abandoned him and joined the victorious, he fled with some of his friends. He was chased by Vizier Omar who arrested and ordered him to be executed, and assumed all authority. This revolution happened about the end of 762 A.H. (1361 A.D.).*

Now, what was the attitude of Ibn Khaldun in this new upheaval? He was, as usual, always by the side of the victorious, standing under his banner without hesitation. When Omar ibn Abdulla assumed authority, he confirmed him in his post and increased his pay. But Ibn Khaldun was not satisfied with this result. He was impelled, as he says, "by the fervour of youth to aspire to a higher situation". He had, since the days of Sultan Abu

* *Kitab al-Ibar*, Vol. VII, pp. 312-14.

Enan, old friendly relations with Vizier Omar, and relied on this friendship to obtain the Vizier's favour. He thought that the opportunity had come to arrive at the higher posts of the state, such as that of grand chamberlain or of vizier. But Vizier Omar disappointed him, perhaps rightly apprehending his ambitions and plans. Ibn Khaldun was offended and resigned his post. This conduct annoyed the Vizier who began to treat him coldly.

Ibn Khaldun, fearing the consequences, asked to be allowed to return to Tunis, his home. The Vizier refused fearing that Ibn Khaldun might, on his way meet his enemy, Abu Hamu, Emir of Tlemcen, which had been recaptured by Banu Abd al-Wad. Ibn Khaldun appealed to Masud ibn Massi, Vizier Omar's colleague and brother-in-law, who helped him and obtained for him permission to depart on condition that he should not go to Tlemcen on his way. Ibn Khaldun then decided to go to Andalusia. It is here that Ibn Khaldun tells us, for the first time, about his wife and children. He says that he sent them to their uncles in Constantine. It is therefore evident that Ibn Khaldun was married and had children. He had not told us before that he was married and we do not know exactly when he was married. We believe, however, that he was married in 754 A.H., that is to say

ten years previously, when he was travelling in Middle Barbary on his departure from Tunis in 753 A.H. At that time he lived in Bougie, not far from Constantine. We shall see that henceforth Ibn Khaldun speaks to us of his family and of their movements with him wherever he goes. But he tells us nothing of it, his children or family life.

CHAPTER III

The Journey to Andalusia

Muhammad ibn al-Ahmar, King of Granada, and his vizier Ibn al-Khatib. The misfortune of Ibn al-Ahmar and his refuge with his vizier in the court of Fez The ode of Ibn al-Khatib to urge the King of Morocco to succour his King Ibn al-Khatib and Ibn Khaldun. Ibn al-Ahmar recaptures his throne and restores Ibn al-Khatib to his post. Ibn Khaldun's visit to granada His cordial relations with Ibn al-Ahmar. He was sent as ambassador to the King of Castille Ibn Khaldun's report about his visit to Seville, his grandfather's home. The coldness of his relations with Ibn al-Khatib His departure from Andalusia.

THE King who was sitting at that time on the throne of Granada (Andalusia) was Muhammad ibn Yousuf ibn Ismail ibn al-Ahmar al-Nasri (the Nasrite). He ascended the throne on the death of his father, Sultan Yousuf Abul Hajjaj, in 755 A.H. (1354 A.D.). As he was young and weak, his chamberlain, Abul Naim Radwan assumed absolute power. Among his ministers was Lisan al-Din Muhammad ibn al-Khatib, the most renowned writer and poet of Andalusia who had occupied the same post in the days of his father. Sultan Abu Enan had arrested his brother, Sultan Abu Salem, and his other brothers and deported

them to Andalusia, as already stated. Sultan Muhammad welcomed them, and there were strong ties of friendship between him and Sultan Abu Salem. When Sultan Abu Enan died and Abu Salem recaptured his throne in Shaban, 760 A.H., the relations between the two emirs were very friendly. But a few weeks after the accession of Abu Salem a calamity befell his friend, Sultan Muhammad, who lost his throne about the end of Ramadan, 760 A.H. His brother Ismail was supported by a number of leaders foremost among whom was his brother-in-law, who was at the same time one of his cousins, named Al-Rais (Chief) Abu Abdulla. He used to make secret propaganda in favour of Ismail and was awaiting an opportunity to attack Muhammad. He therefore availed himself, one day, of his absence from Granada, seized, with a number of followers, the fort of Al-Hamra (Alhambra), killed the chamberlain, Radwan, and proclaimed Ismail, the King's brother, Sultan in his place. Muhammad escaped to Gaudix and his vizier Ibn al-Khatib was arrested.* Abu Salem hearing of the adversity of his friend, and faithful to their old friendship, sent an

* Lisan al-Din ibn al-Khatib is Muhammad ibn Abdulla ibn Sa'eed. He was one of the greatest Andalusian writers and poets of the Eighth Century A.H. He was born at Loja, near Granada, in 713 A.H (1313 A.D.). He made extensive studies and distinguished himself in verse and prose. He also studied medicine and philosophy and entered the service of the

envoy to Andalusia to induce the government of Granada to allow the deposed Sultan and his vizier, who was under arrest, to cross to Morocco. The envoy succeeded in his mission and returned to Morocco with Sultan Muhammad and his vizier (Moharram, 761).* They were warmly welcomed in Fez by Abu Salem, and their arrival was celebrated with great pomp. Ibn al-Khatib then recited a great ode appealing to Abu Salem to succour his Sultan.

Ibn Khaldun was among those who attended this ceremony. He tells us that Ibn al-Khatib's ode brought tears to the eyes of the audience; so great was their emotion. He himself says that his hearers were moved to trembling. That was the first occasion on which these two great men, alike in

Sultan of Granada in his early youth. He was secretary and afterwards minister to Sultan Abul Hajjaj and later to his son Muhammad whose misfortunes and exile he shared. When the Sultan recaptured his throne, he was restored to his former posts and for a time alone managed the affairs of the state When his power waned and his influence weakened, he migrated to Morocco and sought the patronage of its Sultan, but his enemies tried to crush him and he was finally accused of atheism and was arrested, executed and his body burned in 766 A.H. (1374 A.D.). He left a great number of works the most important of which are: "*Al-Ihata fi Akhbar Gharnata*", "*Tarikh al-Dawla al-Nasria*", "*Rayhanat al-Kuttab*", "*Al-Sihr wal shi'r*", "*Al-Katibat al-Kamina*". He wrote many essays and Makkari devoted for him and his works two large volumes of his book *Nafh al-Tib*.

* See the detailed account of these events in *Tarikh al-Dawla al-Nasria* by Ibn al-Khatib, p. 108 and the following, and *Kitab al-Ibar*, Vol. VII, p. 306 and the following.

many respects, met. They were both the greatest masters of thought and letters of their age and country. Each of them was an outstanding personality in the events of his age with which he was closely connected, taking part in them, oscillating between triumph and adversity. Each of them was minister, some times dictator and some times adviser to the princes of his age, inciting for them or against them. Ibn Khaldun occupied in the states of North Africa the same position as Ibn al-Khatib in Andalusia. He was in North Africa the foremost thinker and writer, as Ibn al-Khatib was in Andalusia. Both were united by ties of friendship and loyalty, but afterwards disunited by jealousy and rivalry. Yet each of them had the greatest respect for the other and appreciation of his talents and qualities. Each of them wrote the biography of the other, and spoke of him most highly. In his biography of Ibn al-Khatib, Ibn Khaldun says that he was unsurpassed in verse and prose and filled the state with his odes, and his fame extended very far. He then speaks of the excellent style of the royal letters he wrote, and admired his administrative talents.* Ibn al-Khatib, in his biography of Ibn

* This biography is given in Ibn Khaldun's report of the events of Andalusia and Morocco, *Kitab al-Ibar*, Vol. VII, p. 332 and the following. See the report of Ibn Khaldun on the murder of Ibn al-Khatib, *ibid*, p. 341.

Khaldun, says that he was a man of great virtue, brilliant qualities, highly respectable, most bashful of ancient glory, very dignified, resolute, revolting against any humiliation, stubborn, courageous, aspiring to the highest posts, favoured by fortune, versed in many branches of science and literature, with versatile qualities, precise in research, of great common-sense, etc.* This respect of the two men for each other is further shown by their mutual correspondence.

Sultan Muhammad remained in the court of Fez for some time and Abu Salem did his utmost to honour him. Ibn al-Khatib also went about Morocco for some time and finally settled in Salli. There were cordial relations between Ibn Khaldun, who was then one of the high officials of the state, and the dethroned prince whom he served and whose desires he accomplished. When the Emir went to Andalusia to try to recapture his throne Ibn Khaldun was left in charge of his family, and he did his utmost for their comfort. There were also friendly ties between him and Ibn al-Khatib which grew stronger with time. Sultan Muhammad tried to recapture his throne with the assistance of Pedro the Cruel, King of Castille, in execution

* See this biography in *Al-Ihata fi Akhbar Ghamata*, quoted by Al-Makkari in *Nafh al-Tib*, Vol. IV, p 413 and the following

of an agreement made between them.

But when the King of Castille heard of the murder of Sultan Abu Salem, he delayed the execution of the agreement. Muhammad then appealed to the Vizier, Omar Ibn Abdulla, then absolute master of Morocco, and sought the intervention of Ibn Khaldun who then enjoyed the Vizier's favour, in the hope of granting him one of the Andalusian towns appertaining to Morocco, to be used as his headquarters. The Sultan granted him Ronda and the surrounding country, and continued his efforts till he succeeded in recapturing his throne from the hands of his enemies. He entered Granada triumphantly in Jumada II, 763 A.H. and firmly assumed the power. He brought his family from Fez, summoned Ibn al-Khatib, and restored him to his former post and influence.

The relations between Ibn Khaldun and his friend, the Vizier Omar, were then uncertain, and he decided to go to Andalusia, as already said. As there were strong ties of friendship between him and the Sultan of Granada and his vizier, and as he had rendered them great services, we can well imagine the motives of his journey and the hopes he entertained. He went to Ceuta early in the year 764 A.H. whence he crossed to Andalusia, and wrote to the Sultan and Ibn al-Khatib announc-

ing his arrival. On arrival at the valley of Granada he received a polite letter from Ibn al-Khatib welcoming him. He reached Granada on the 8th Rabi I. The Sultan welcomed and honoured him much, invited him to his private council and preferred his company. Ibn al-Khatib also showed him the utmost honour and patronage. The following year (765 A.H., 1363 A.D.) the Sultan sent him as Ambassador to Pedro the Cruel, King of Castille, with a magnificent present, to conclude peace and friendly relations between them. Ibn Khaldun went to Seville, where the King then held his court and was cordially received. Ibn Khaldun here tells us that he saw the vestiges of his ancestors in Seville which, as we have seen, was the home of Banu Khaldun, where for some time their star had shone. The King of Castille knew the history of his family. Ibn Khaldun was presented to him and his prominent position explained by a Jew doctor at his court, called Ibrahim ibn Zarur, who had made his acquaintance at the court of Sultan Abu Enan when he summoned him to treat him. Ibn Khaldun further tells us that the King of Castille proposed that he should remain in his service, and that he would try to induce the chiefs of the state to restore to him the legacy of his family in Seville, but he refused. There was no

doubt that Ibn Khaldun was too intelligent to believe that the King of Castille was serious in his proposal. Ibn Khaldun successfully accomplished his mission, and was presented by the King with a splendid mule with saddle and bridle adorned with gold, which he presented to the Sultan. On his return the Sultan gave him the village of Elvira in the Vega of Granada, thus increasing his income. He asked the Sultan's permission to bring his family from Constantine, and the Sultan issued the necessary permit. He lived in prosperity and tranquillity with his family, but soon after he began to feel that the Sultan treated him coldly, and that this was evidently due to the intrigues of Ibn al-Khatib, who adopted the same attitude; the vizier fearing, no doubt, his rivalry and machinations. Ibn Khaldun realized that he could no longer remain in Granada. At the same time he received a letter from his friend Abu Abdulla Muhammad, Emir of Bougie informing him that he had recaptured his throne and would be pleased to receive him. Ibn Khaldun then decided to leave Andalusia and asked the Sultan's permission. The Sultan granted his request, made him many gifts and bade him a cordial farewell. Ibn Khaldun left Granada and sailed from Almeria to Bougie in the middle of the year 766 A.H. (1364 A.D.).

CHAPTER IV

The Height of Adventure

Abu Abdulla Muhammad, Emir of Bougie His recapturing of the throne and his recall of Ibn Khaldun Ibn Khaldun becomes absolute Hajib in Bougie The capture of Bougie by Abul Abbas, Emir of Constantine, and the murder of Emir Muhammad Ibn Khaldun sides with the victorious. His disagreement with Abul Abbas and flight to Biskra. The moral of this event. Abu Hamu, Sultan of Tlemcen summons Ibn Khaldun He declines but tries to support him. Sultan Abd al-Aziz, the Merinite, conquers Tlemcen Ibn Khaldun meets him and works for the advance of his interests. Ibn al-Khatib arrives in Morocco Ibn Khaldun leaves for Fez Development of events in Morocco and the rise of Sultan Abul Abbas Ahmad. Intrigues against Ibn Khaldun Ibn Khaldun leaves for Andalusia. Application to extradite him Murder of Ibn al-Khatib.

THE Emir of Bougie did not forget his friend in adversity after the victory. He did not forget that this friend suffered for his sake captivity and imprisonment. He therefore summoned him to collaborate with him and thus to fulfil the promise he had made. Bougie was previously among the possessions of the Kingdom of Tunis (Ifrikia) under the Hafsite dynasty. When Emir Abu Yahia al-Lihyani conquered Tunis in the year 711 A.H., he ceded the ports to his sons, one of whom, Emir Abu Zakaria, was the ruler of

Bougie and who continued to govern it till he died in the year 746 A.H. He was succeeded by his eldest son Emir Abu Abdulla Muhammad. When Sultan Abul Hassan marched on Tunis, Emir Muhammad was dethroned, as the other emirs were, and deported to Morocco. When Sultan Abu Enan rose against his father during his absence in Tunis, he restored the dethroned emirs to their ports, including Emir Muhammad, in order to oppose his father on his return. Muhammad continued for some time to govern Bougie, and on the death of Sultan Abul Hassan Abu Enan was firmly established on the throne, and again captured Bougie from its ruler, forced him to cede it and deported him to Morocco. He remained there till Ibn Khaldun entered the service of Sultan Abu Enan. The relations of Ibn Khaldun with the dethroned Emir became stronger owing to the old friendship between the two families. Ibn Khaldun was accused of conspiring with his friend and of facilitating for him the means of flight to recapture his throne and to appoint him Hajib (Minister). He was imprisoned for two years till the death of Sultan Abu Enan. On the accession of Sultan Abu Salem, Ibn Khaldun tried to obtain the release of Emir Muhammad and the other deported emirs and the restoration to their ports. Emir Muham-

mad gave him a written promise to make him Hajib when he recaptures his throne. The Emir marched on Bougie and managed to wrench it from the hands of his enemies in 765 A.H. and appointed Yahia, the youngest brother of Ibn Khaldun, vizier and summoned Ibn Khaldun from Andalusia to make him Hajib in fulfilment of his promise. Ibn Khaldun responded, having decided to leave Andalusia. He reached Bougie in the middle of the year 766 A H. and was accorded a grand reception by the Emir of Bougie and its inhabitants. Ibn Khaldun describes for us the day of his arrival in these high-sounding words: "The Sultan gave me a grand reception, organized a procession to meet me; the inhabitants of the city hastened from all parts, touching my clothes and kissing my hand. It was a grand day."

Ibn Khaldun at once took up his duties as Hajib to the Sultan of Bougie. At that time the post of Hajib, in the North African states, according to his definition, was "management of all the affairs of the state, and the exclusive organization of the relations between the Sultan and his subjects". He assumed absolute power and managed all affairs vigorously, calming dissension skilfully and wisely, and going about among the mountain tribes collecting taxes by the force of his sagacity and

influence. Soon after a conflict arose between the Emir of Bougie and his cousin Sultan Abul Abbas, ruler of Constantine. Abul Abbas aspired after the conquest of Bougie and roused the neighbouring tribes against the Emir. Ibn Khaldun also tells us that the Emir did not treat the inhabitants of Bougie properly but oppressed them and they therefore decided to renounce their allegiance to him being incited by Abul Abbas. In the year 767 A.H. Abul Abbas marched with his forces to Bougie and fought Emir Muhammad in its suburbs, defeated and killed him, and entered Bougie triumphantly. In the meantime Ibn Khaldun remained in the palace of Bougie. When Muhammad was defeated some of the chiefs proposed to Ibn Khaldun to assume authority and proclaim one of the Sultan's sons Emir. He refused and as usual went to greet the victorious and to stand by him. Ibn Khaldun handed the city over to Abul Abbas who honoured him and retained him for some time in his post. But soon after Ibn Khaldun felt that he no longer enjoyed the favour of the Emir and therefore retired to one of the neighbouring districts. Later on Abul Abbas decided to arrest him; he therefore fled to Biskra, but Abul Abbas arrested his younger brother Yahia, kept him prisoner in Bona, searched their houses and confiscated their property.

Thus ended this ambitious adventure of Ibn Khaldun. Like his previous adventures it proved his exaggerated egoism, his ingratitude and his disposition to avail himself of favourable opportunities however much they were contrary to loyalty and gratitude. In all his plans and actions Ibn Khaldun exhibited deep despise of sentiment and moral principles; he was moved by that strong spirit which Machiavelli later admired and imagined in his ideal prince—that audacious, stubborn spirit which overcomes every human weakness and leads directly to the coveted end by all means. Ibn Khaldun tries to express his regret at the manner the events developed. He tells us elsewhere, in speaking of the unfortunate Emir of Bougie: "When this Emir, Abu Abdulla, summoned me I hastened to obey him. If God had willed, it would not have been done. If I had known the future I would have tried to arrive at much better results."*

But there is no doubt that Ibn Khaldun, in the events of Bougie, was carrying on an adventure of his own and was striving to gather the fruits of an occasion he sought and prepared long before. There is no doubt, also, that the death of his ally and master did not harm or grieve him; he had hoped

* *Kitab al-Ibar*, Vol. VI, p 377

to stand by the victorious, had the latter not dispensed with his services.

Ibn Khaldun then went to Biskra having friendly relations with its Emir. There he remained watching the events. Emir Abu Hamu Musa ibn Abd al-Rahman, Sultan of Tlemcen, was the brother-in-law of the deceased Emir of Bougie and aspired to conquer that city. When he heard of the death of his brother-in-law he sent his forces to Bougie in order to capture it, but they were terribly defeated. Abu Hamu then wrote to Ibn Khaldun summoning him from Biskra to appoint him his Hajib, being aware of his influence in Bougie and the surrounding tribes. In fact, he sent him the edict of his appointment, and wrote to him asking that he should try to induce the tribes to side with him. On this occasion Ibn Khaldun declined the offer and instead sent his brother Yahia, who had been released from prison. But he responded to the request to induce the tribes and divert them from the side of Abul Abbas to that of his enemy Abu Hamu. Ibn Khaldun tells us that he was tired of the dangers of adventure and of the terrors of the post, and no more sought after honours ; he longed to study which he had abandoned for many years. He decided to resume study and to abandon the field of politics and government service. We

shall, however, see that he returns to the theatre of events and participates in other political adventures.

Ibn Khaldun now received letters from his friend Ibn al-Khatib expressing his desire to see him, assuring him of his affection, and giving him news of Andalusia and speaking of his literary activities and new books. He replied expressing the same sentiments, speaking of his misfortune in Bougie, and giving him news of North Africa and Egypt which had reached him.* These letters show the appreciation and respect they had for each other.

Ibn Khaldun continued his stay in Biskra summoning the tribes to support the cause of Abu Hamu and to side with him against Abul Abbas, and on the other hand trying to strengthen the bonds of alliance between Abu Hamu and Abu Ishaq, Sultan of Tunis. The relations between the latter and his brother, Abul Abbas, were not cordial. The difficulties of Abu Hamu increased by the rebellion of his cousin Abu Zayan. Ibn Khaldun worked harder to gather the tribes to his banner. He then went with the ruler of Biskra, and the other chiefs whom he had won over, and their forces to succour Abu Hamu who was getting ready to fight his enemies (771 A.H.). But he was again defeated and Ibn Khaldun had to retire to Biskra

* See this correspondence in *Kitab al-Ibar*, Vol VII, pp. 421-30.

to resume his activities to raise the tribes to his succour, and to strengthen the relations between him and the Sultan of Tunis.

In the following year Ibn Khaldun went with a number of chiefs to visit Abu Hamu and confer with him on the plan to be adopted. He met him in Algiers and remained with him for some time, and recited to him a charming ode of congratulation on the occasion of the Bairam feast.

But the loyalty of Ibn Khaldun to the Emir of Tlemcen did not last long. Soon after he turned back on him and sided with his enemy, inciting the tribes against him after having induced them to support him. The Sultan of Morocco, Abd al-Aziz ibn al-Hassan, marched at that time with his forces to invade Tlemcen and again wrench it from the grasp of Banu Abd al-Wad. The Vizier Omar ibn Abdulla had assumed absolute power in Morocco since the murder of Sultan Abu Salem in 762 A.H., as already stated, and put on the throne puppet kings and young men of Banu Mareen (Merinites). In the year 768 A.H. he put on the throne Sultan Abd al-Aziz, son of Sultan Abul Hassan who was his captive and as usual deprived him of all authority. The Sultan was indignant; he revolted against the Vizier Omar and secretly had him murdered and crushed his relatives, and regained

complete authority. He then marched with his forces to Middle Barbary, aiming at the conquest of Tlemcen and the destruction of the authority of Banu Abd al-Wad. Ibn Khaldun was then the guest of Abu Hamu. When he heard of the approach of the King of Morocco and saw that the road to Biskra was closed before him and insurrection was spreading everywhere, he apprehended the consequences and asked Abu Hamu to allow him to go to Andalusia. The Sultan granted his request, and gave him a letter to the King of Granada. Ibn Khaldun hastened to the port of Hanin to sail, but the King of Morocco had then arrived with his army in Tlemcen and Abu Hamu had to go to the desert to assemble his forces. The King of Morocco hearing that Ibn Khaldun was in Hanin carrying treasures for Abu Hamu, sent a detachment of troops to arrest him. He was surprised at the port and when searched nothing was found on him. He was therefore taken to the Sultan who was camping near Tlemcen. The Sultan made an inquiry about him, rebuked him for abandoning the Merinites and taking side with their enemies. Ibn Khaldun gave as excuse his misunderstanding with the Vizier Omar and some chiefs interceded in his favour and spoke of his previous services to Banu Mareen. Moreover

Ibn Khaldun promised the Sultan to help him to restore Bougie when he would express the desire to conquer it. The Sultan was pleased and after a night of captivity ordered his release. He retired to a place in the desert known by the name of Ribat Abu Madyan* and remained there for a time busying himself in his solitude with reading and study.

When Sultan Abd al-Aziz recaptured Tlemcen (772 A.H.) he summoned Ibn Khaldun and charged him with the task of attracting the tribes to side with him against his enemy Abu Hamu. Ibn Khaldun accepted the mission and began to gather the tribes and induce them to fight his former friend. He took part in the expedition sent by the Sultan to chase Abu Hamu, and endeavoured, by his influence and sagacity, among the chiefs and shaikhs, to sever the tribes from Abu Hamu. The King's forces continued to follow Abu Hamu till they surprised him in the depth of the desert and destroyed his camp. Abu Hamu and his family fled under the cover of night. Ibn Khaldun after remaining some days with his family in Biskra went to Sultan Abd al-Aziz in Tlemcen and was received cordially. The Sultan then sent him to try to calm some of the rebel tribes in Middle Barbary and

* The "Ribat" is a place of retirement devoted to worship.

restore them to his allegiance. He obeyed, but he was not successful on this occasion. He returned to Biskra and contented himself with reporting to the Sultan. Just then he learned of the arrival of his friend Ibn al-Khatib at the Sultan's court in Tlemcen, having fled from Andalusia to escape the vengeance of the Sultan of Granada with whom his relations had been disturbed. Sultan Abd al-Aziz received him with honour and covered him with his favours. Ibn al-Khatib wrote to his friend in Biskra giving him his news and reproaching him for his conduct, when he was in Andalusia. Ibn Khaldun replied by a touching letter assuring him of his appreciation and affection, and defending himself against the charge of infidelity, and congratulating him on his escape.*

Ibn Khaldun continued to reside in Biskra while insurrection was raging in all parts of Middle Barbary. When the Sultan organized an expedition, commanded by his Vizier Abu Bakr ibn Ghazi, to fight the insurgents, he charged Ibn Khaldun, once more, with the duty to quieten the tribes. Ibn Khaldun accomplished this mission, and went to meet the Vizier in the desert with the chiefs of the loyal tribes. He then returned to Biskra, but did not remain there long, having found that its

* *Kitab al-Ibar*, Vol. VII, pp. 434-36.

Emir was inclined to insurrection. He therefore left with his family to join the Sultan at Tlemcen, but on his way he heard of the Sultan's death and the accession of his son Al-Sa'eed under the guardianship of Vizier Ibn Ghazi and the return of the whole court to Fez (774 A.H.). He now decided to proceed to Fez crossing the desert with some of the Sultan's suite and troops. The caravan met, on its way, a band of brigands incited by Abu Hamu who had recaptured Tlemcen on the death of the Sultan and robbed the passengers' baggage. Ibn Khaldun and his family escaped captivity with much difficulty, and finally reached Fez in a miserable condition. He was cordially received by the Vizier, Ibn Ghazi, who assured him of his patronage. He remained in Fez and became the object of reverence.

At that time the relations between the courts of Fez and Granada were not good. As the Vizier Ibn al-Khatib had taken refuge at the court of Banu Mareen the Sultan of Andalusia, Muhammad ibn al-Ahmar asked the court of Fez to expel him. The Vizier Ibn Ghazi refused and sent some of the refugees of Banu al-Ahmar to rouse opposition against the government of Andalusia ; on the other hand Ibn al-Ahmar sent two of the chiefs of Morocco who were in Andalusia, Abd al-Rahman

ibn Yaflus, a Merinite emir, and the Vizier Masud ibn Massi, to foment agitation against the government of Fez. They went with his fleet to the coast of Morocco and besieged Gibraltar which was then in the possession of the Merinites. Vizier Ibn Ghazi sent an army commanded by his cousin Muhammad ibn Osman to fight the insurgents. Ibn al-Ahmar induced him to support his cause and incited him to secede. He raised the standard of revolt and declared Emir Ahmad, son of Sultan Abu Salem, who was then in captivity in Tangiers, King and marched to fight Ibn Ghazi. There were fierce battles between the two sides near Meknes, and Ibn Ghazi retired to Fez and fortified. The insurgents besieged him till he submitted, and dethroned King Al-Sa'eed. Sultan Abul Abbas Ahmad captured Fez (776 A.H.) and appointed Ibn Osman Hajib. Emir Abd al-Rahman took possession of North Morocco in execution of the agreement concluded.

During these events Ibn Khaldun was living in Fez When this change in government took place an intrigue was made against him and he was arrested, but was released on the intervention of his friend Emir Abd al-Rahman, Sultan of the North. He then decided to migrate to Andalusia, all the courts of North Africa being closed against him. Ibn Khaldun says that he wished to go to Andalusia

to settle down and to study. It appears that he had then decided to devote his time to research and writing, the idea having often recurred to him since the political affairs were disturbed and the horizon of North Africa was clouded. He crossed the sea to Andalusia in the spring of 776 A.H. leaving his family in Fez. On his way he met Abu Abdulla ibn Zumruk, Vizier of Ibn al-Ahmar, who was going to the court of Fez to congratulate and negotiate. He asked him to try to obtain the release of his family so that they could join him. But Ibn Khaldun did not take into account the intrigues of his enemies and that he would become the object of bargaining in disgraceful negotiations. In fact the court of Fez apprehended his settlement in Andalusia and refused to allow his family to join him when it was told that Ibn Khaldun was in touch with Emir Abd al-Rahman and that he incited him to invade Morocco. On the other hand Ibn Zumruk went to Fez to try to put in force a disgraceful promise made by the new Sultan of Morocco to Ibn al-Ahmar, as one of the terms of alliance between them. This promise was to bring about the downfall and murder of the Vizier Ibn al-Khatib, Ibn al-Ahmar believing that his former Vizier used to incite Sultan Abd al-Aziz to fight him. Thus the court of Fez found a favourable

opportunity to persecute Ibn Khaldun and to crush him. They asked Ibn al-Ahmar to hand him over to them, on the plea that he was trying to save Ibn al-Khatib. Ibn al-Ahmar refused, but agreed to send back Ibn Khaldun to Africa. The fact is that Ibn Khaldun tried to save his friend. When the revolution broke out, Ibn al-Khatib had taken refuge in Al-Balad al-Jadid, a suburb of Fez, with Vizier Ibn Ghazi. When the new Sultan captured Fez he imprisoned him when Ibn Zumruk arrived and tried to induce the Sultan to kill him. Thus the great thinker, writer and politician, was the victim of disgraceful bargaining and of fanaticism and ignorance, having been accused of atheism in some of his essays. He was tortured, and some ignominious *faqihs* gave *fatwa* (legal decision) that he should be executed. He was strangled in his prison and his body burned (776 A.H., 1374 A.D.)* Ibn Khaldun quotes the following touching verses from a poem Ibn al-Khatib used to recite while in prison making his own elegy:

> We are far, although houses are near;
> We preach although we are silent.
> Our breathing ceased suddenly;
> Like loud prayers followed by murmur.

* *Kitab al-Ibar*, Vol. VII, pp. 341-42.

We were suns in the horizon of greatness;
They set;—they were lamented by all.
Tell our enemies that Ibn al-Khatib is gone;
And passed away;—and who will not pass?
Those among you who rejoice;
Tell them rejoice to-day he who will not die.

CHAPTER V

Retirement and Literary Work

Ibn Khaldun returns to North Africa and resumes his relations with Abu Hamu His refuge in the district of Banu Arif He begins to write his historical work Achievement of the Prolegomena and the history of the Arabs and the Berbers. He tries to return to Tunis. Sultan Abul Abbas grants his request He completes his work and presents it to the Sultan. The ode he composed on the day of presentation The intrigues around him. He accompanies the Sultan on military expeditions. His decision to go to the East He abandons political life

THUS fate almost brought these two friends together for the last time in similar conditions, and almost inflicted them with a common calamity. But Ibn Khaldun was more fortunate than his friend, the Sultan of Granada contenting himself merely with expelling him from his territory and sending him back to Africa. He disembarked at the port of Hanin, bewildered and afraid, not knowing where to go. His brother Yahia had returned to the service of Abu Hamu, Emir of Tlemcen. Abu Hamu was very much annoyed with Ibn Khaldun for the unfriendly attitude he often adopted, and left him wandering

in Hanin. Muhammad ibn Arif, a chief of the Banu Arif and a friend of Ibn Khaldun, interceded in his favour and finally Abu Hamu pardoned him and allowed him to come to Tlemcen where he arrived on the day of the Bairam feast in the year 776 A.H. (1374 A.D.). He now wished to devote his time to study. But Abu Hamu again charged him with the task of inducing the tribes to support him. Ibn Khaldun was obliged and feigned to accept, but it appears that he was definitely disgusted with political adventures. No sooner he left Tlemcen than he turned his face to another direction and went to the district of Banu Arif where he was joined by his family from Tlemcen; and his friends interceded in his favour with Sultan Abu Hamu. Banu Arif welcomed him and gave him and his family one of their palaces in the Salama Fort, situated near Tujin.*

Ibn Khaldun spent four years in that distant, lonely place, and for the first time enjoyed rest and tranquillity, far from the troubles of politics and court intrigues, as well as the dangers of travel and military expeditions. For the first time he got leisure here and an opportunity for research and study.

* This district is situated to the south of Constantine, around the city of Tawghurt, about a hundred miles to the west of the frontier of Tunis.

In that calm interval Ibn Khaldun began to write his historical work. He was now forty-five years old; his researches and studies having become mature. He had spent a quarter of a century in political strife, successively serving North African courts and states, studying their affairs and institutions, learning their views, and crossing the hills and deserts of Barbary, mixing himself with the Berber tribes and studying their characteristics, conditions and traditions in public and private life. His fertile mind, not to speak of these practical studies, overflowed with the fruit of wide knowledge which he did his best to obtain whenever opportunity allowed in the libraries of North Africa and Andalusia. It was a blessed, successful retirement. In that distant, solitary place Ibn Khaldun wrote the Prolegomena of his History, and was inspired with those studies and everlasting theories which occupy a high place among the fruits of human thought, and bequeathed to the legacy of the Arabic language that immortal monument of which it is proud. He concluded his admirable Prolegomena in the middle of the year 779 A.H. (1377 A.D.), in only five months.* He then revised and polished it. He tells us in a tone of astonishment and admiration of his success:

* The Prolegomena, p. 534.

"I achieved the Prolegomena in this wonderful manner, inspired to me in my solitude, ideas and expressions flowing on my mind till they formed a mature and systematic matter."* Having completed the Prolegomena he began to write his History. He wrote the history of the Arabs, the Berbers and the tribe of Zanata; in other words he wrote its first and the last sections in the form presented to us. It was not his intention to write a general history of mankind, but his fundamental object was to write the history of North Africa and the Berber states. Thus he says in the Prolegomena: "In my book I have given, as far as possible, the history of Barbary either in a special or in a general manner, intending to devote this work to the generations, nations and kingdoms of Barbary, omitting the history of other countries owing to my limited knowledge of the conditions of the East and its nations, and because current histories are not comprehensive enough in the desired manner."†

Nevertheless he modified his programme and again decided to write a general history of mankind. But as, in his isolated abode, he lacked important books of reference, he decided to return

* *Kitab al-Ibar*, Vol. VII, p. 444.
† The Prolegomena, p. 27.

to Tunis, his home, where its rich libraries would afford him an opportunity for research. This was in the middle of the year 780 A.H. (1378 A.D.) after completing the Prolegomena and the chapters on the history of the Arabs and the Berbers.

At that time Sultan Abu Abbas was on the throne of Tunis, whom we know as Emir of Constantine and who had then wrenched Bougie from his cousin, Emir Muhammad, and appointed Ibn Khaldun his Hajib. He was then displeased with Ibn Khaldun, and tried to arrest him but he fled to Biskra; the Sultan then arrested his brother Yahia in Bona and confiscated their property. For some time Abul Abbas watched for an opportunity to seize Tunis; its minister, Ibn Tafrakin, who, for some time, was its sole dictator, having been deprived of authority by Sultan Abu Ishaq, went to Abul Abbas and tried to help him to realize his project. In 771 A.H. Abul Abbas marched on Tunis with a large force and wrenched it from the hands of its infant Sultan, the son of Abu Ishaq. He then successively captured all the ports of Tunisia. The Hafsite Kingdom again arose strong and firmly established itself. The relations between Sultan Abul Abbas and Ibn Khaldun were disturbed since the events of Bougie, that is to say more than ten years before. When the historian

decided to return to Tunis, his birthplace and the abode of his family, moved by love of home and the desire to study, he wrote to Sultan Abul Abbas praying for pardon and permission to return. The Sultan granted his pardon. He therefore left Banu Arif in Rajab, 780 A.H., crossed the desert and, on his way, passed by Constantine where he stayed as the guest of Emir Ibrahim, son of Sultan Abul Abbas. He then went to see Sultan Abul Abbas who was then at the head of his army trying to quell the revolution in some parts of the country. He met him in the outskirts of Susa. The Sultan received him cordially, honoured him and consulted him on his affairs. He then sent him to Tunis and gave orders that no comfort should be spared him as regards abode and living. Ibn Khaldun arrived in Tunis, his birthplace, for the first time since he left it as a youth under twenty in the year 753 A.H. He sent for his family from Banu Arif and lived quietly in security and prosperity devoting himself to study and research, till the Sultan returned from his military expeditions a few months later. The Sultan covered him with favour, made him one of his companions and urged him to complete his work. Ibn Khaldun now felt that the old intrigues were being resumed against him, on account of the Sultan's patronage. The

leader of these intrigues was his old adversary, Al-Faqih ibn Arafa, the Grand Mufti. Ibn Khaldun explains the cause of this hostility in his superiority over Ibn Arafa in literary councils, so that the students of Ibn Arafa preferred to attend his lectures, and his activities with the officials of the court, hence his spite against Ibn Khaldun to undermine his position. For some time these intrigues had no effect, so firm was his position and prestige.

When the historian gathered material for research he began to complete his book, and to revise and enlarge it. When the first copy was ready he submitted it to Sultan Abul Abbas, his patron, early in 784 A.H. (1382 A.D.). This copy comprised the Prolegomena, the history of the Berbers and Zanata, the history of the Arabs before and after Islam, and the history of the various Moslem dynasties.* Ibn Khaldun related the history of the Berber states of his own time till the recapture of Tawzir by Sultan Abul Abbas in 783 A.H.† But this first copy was later enlarged by the addition of other long sections on the history of Moslem dynasties in the East, the history of the ancient nations and the Christian nations, as will be explained elsewhere in this book.

* *Kitab al-Ibar*, Vol. VII, pp. 345-46.
† *Ibid.*, Vol. VI, p. 396.

On the day Ibn Khaldun submitted the first copy of his book to Sultan Abul Abbas, he recited to him a long ode of about one hundred verses, speaking of his qualities and deeds, invoking his favour and patronage, and pointing to the importance of his book. This ode which is one of his most important poems, begins thus:

> Is there but your home a refuge for a stranger?
> Is there but your patronage an object of aspiration?

Speaking of his work he says:

> Here in the histories of time and peoples
> Are lessons the morals of which are followed by the just.
> I summarized all the books of the ancients
> And recorded what they omitted.
> I smoothed the methods of expression
> As if they submitted to my will.
> I dedicate it, a glory, to your realm,
> Which shines, and is the object of pride.
> I swear that I did not exaggerate
> A bit; exaggeration is hateful to me.

This tranquillity enjoyed by Ibn Khaldun, for a time, was, however, soon disturbed. Ibn Arafa and his friends, the historian's enemies, continued their intrigues. Their attempt was without effect in depriving the historian of the King's favour; it

however led to annoying him in another manner. When the Sultan was on the point of marching, with his army, to fight the insurgents in Tawzir andthe surrounding districts in the year 783 A.H., he ordered Ibn Khaldun to accompany him. He obeyed but reluctantly. In fact he was disgusted with the turmoil of politics and was weary of these dangerous royal missions. When the expedition accomplished its purpose the Sultan granted his request to return before him. He went to his farm in the neighbourhood of Tunis where he remained till the victorious return of the Sultan and accompanied him to Tunis. A few months later, the Sultan prepared again to march with his army. Ibn Khaldun, fearing that he might be ordered again to accompany the Sultan in his expeditions, and that he would no longer enjoy any tranquillity, decided to leave Tunis and thought of proceeding for the holy pilgrimage, as an excuse. He begged the Sultan to relieve him of his duties and to allow him to accomplish his pious wish. His request was granted and Ibn Khaldun again left his birthplace. This time it was to return no more. He went to the port in a touching procession of notables, friends and students who bade him good-bye in demonstrations of deep regret. He sailed to the East in the middle of Shaaban, 784 A.H. (October, 1382 A.D.).

Thus concluded Ibn Khaldun, in North Africa, an eventful and most adventurous life. This, undoubtedly, was not a brilliant epilogue, nor did it satisfy his great soul. There is no doubt that Ibn Khaldun was the greatest politician and thinker Africa and Andalusia knew in the eighth century A.H. Those brilliant qualities and talents which raised him to the summit of events and made of him an outstanding personality in the history of North Africa and its political evolutions for a quarter of a century, and which helped him to arrive at leadership and great influence among those desert tribes always noted for stubbornness and rough disposition, were apt to elevate him to a high, stable position in the states and courts of that age. Ibn Khaldun spent a quarter of a century in political strife and palace intrigues. He served all the Berber states, often enjoyed the advantages of leadership and authority and often suffered the adversities of disfavour and the bitterness of imprisonment and the dangers of death. After so much trouble and effort he finds himself where he began; he loses the favour of all the courts and states he served and to some of which he rendered great services, and finds himself in the last refuge to which he resorted and where he enjoyed some tranquillity. For some time he felt the bitterness of

disappointment and sought consolation in research and literary work, his soul burning with the passion for struggle and adventure; he became disgusted with politics and was reluctant to resume those royal missions the accomplishment of which paved his way to influence and authority. He sought leisure and quiet life after long wanderings and hoped to end his days in his own country and be buried by the side of his fathers. But he did not attain even that modest aspiration and was disturbed by the machinations of his enemies in his quiet abode, and finally feared the consequences of spite and intrigues. He did not find in Tunis the tranquillity he sought, and was obliged to invoke pilgrimage as pretext for departure and safety, to bid his relatives and family good-bye and leave his fatherland alone, not knowing what the fate had in store for him.

PART II

Ibn Khaldun in Egypt

784-808 A.H., 1382-1406 A.D.

CHAPTER VI

The Lecturer and the Judge

Ibn Khaldun arrives in Egypt. His description of Cairo. He lectures in Al-Azhar. Introduction to the court. His appointment as Professor in the Kamhiah School. His first lecture. His appointment as Maliki judge. Disturbed atmosphere around him. His comments on the conditions of justice. He is criticized by Egyptian writers. Loss of his family He is relieved of the post of judge, but remains a lecturer. His voyage to the Holy Land. He is appointed Professor in the Sarghatmash School. He is appointed Shaikh to the Beibars Sufi Institute The revolt of Yalbugha al-Nasiri and the dethronement of Sultan Barquq. The fall of Yalbugha and the restoration of Barquq. Reflections of Ibn Khaldun on the Egyptian state. He devotes himself to study and research. His efforts to organize relations between the Egyptian court and the courts of North Africa.

I

IBN Khaldun left Tunis in the middle of Shaaban, 784 A.H. (October 1382 A.D.) and arrived at the port of Alexandria on Bairam after a difficult sea voyage. He tells us that he arrived in Egypt to join the pilgrims' caravan, and that he spent a month in Alexandria making preparations. As he could not then realize his desire, he went to Cairo.*

* *Kitab al-Ibar*, Vol. VII, p. 452.

But the performance of his religious duty was merely a pretext to leave Tunis. His arrival in Egypt was, as we have seen, a sort of flight dictated by fear of misfortune. No doubt he hoped to spend his life in Egypt in tranquillity and ease, and to enjoy that settled life which his struggle and adventure in North Africa did not afford him. He was then fifty-two years old, but was full of activity and vigour, always aspiring after posts of influence and honour. Cairo was, at that time, the centre of Moslem learning of the East and West, and its court was widely reputed for the patronage of science and literature. He thus hoped to enjoy this patronage. Ibn Khaldun arrived in Cairo on the first of the month of Zul-Kaada, 784 A.H. (November, 1382 A.D.) and was dazzled by its extent, grandeur and beauty, as it dazzled, half a century before, his predecessor and countryman, the traveller, Ibn Batuta, and as it dazzled, in the course of ages, all the eminent men of the East and West who visited it. This was natural, for the historian saw in North Africa only humble desert towns and did not see in Andalusia, where he spent some time, a town equal to Cairo in grandeur and splendour. On arriving in Cairo he greets the city with an enthusiasm which reveals deep admiration, charm and emotion, and describes it in these

resounding words: "I have seen the capital of the world, the garden of the universe, the theatre of nations, the meeting-place of myriads of mankind, the seat of Islam, the capital of the Kingdom; palaces and castles loom in its horizon, institutes and schools shine in its sky, its scholars (*ulama*) shining like moons and stars...; the streets of the city are too crowded with people, and its markets overflow with riches."

Ibn Khaldun was not a stranger in Egypt, for the society of Cairo knew much about him. The reputation of his voluminous work, and particularly his famous Prolegomena had preceded him, and some time before the first copies were known in Egypt and in other countries of the East, the intellectual and literary circles had begun to admire the originality of the Prolegomena, its new style and brilliance of its contents. Therefore, no sooner he arrived in Cairo than scholars and students flocked from all parts to see him. Ibn Khaldun tells us with both pride and modesty: "Students hurried to me seeking knowledge notwithstanding my little acquirements and would accept no excuse."* This is alluded to by his Egyptian biographers too; thus Abul Mahasin ibn Taghri Birdi says of Ibn Khaldun: "He settled in Cairo, and, for some time,

* *Kitab al-Ibar*, Vol. VII, p. 452

lectured in Al-Azhar Mosque, studied and taught others."* Al-Sakhawi says: "The inhabitants of Cairo welcomed and honoured him, frequented his circle; in fact he lectured for some time in the Mosque of Al-Azhar."† Ibn Khaldun lectured in Al-Azhar, and it seems to us that he lectured on Hadith and Maliki jurisprudence, and explained his theories on society, vitality *(Al-asabiyah)*, the foundations of sovereignty, the rise of states and other subjects dealt with in his Prolegomena. These lectures were the best proof of his deep knowledge, his vast research and charming exposition. Ibn Khaldun was a brilliant causeur and lecturer, astounding his hearers with his logic and fluency. This is told us by a number of famous Egyptian scholars and writers who attended his lectures, among whom was the great historian Taki al-Din al-Makrizi who attended his lectures as a young man. Likewise Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar who also attended his lectures and profited by his erudition, describes him in these words: "He was very eloquent, an excellent essayist, and exhibited deep knowledge of the subjects, particularly those

* *Kitab al-Manhal al-Safi* (manuscript in the Egyptian Library), Vol. II, p 300

† *Kitab al-Dawu al-Lami* (photographic manuscript in the Egyptian Library), Vol II, Section II, p 367.

relating to the state."* Al-Sakhawi, quoting Al-Bishbishi and Al-Rikraki, tells us that he was very fluent, handsome, and that he was an ideal lecturer.†

Thus Ibn Khaldun was able, as soon as he arrived, to win the sympathy of the society of Cairo, and to rouse its admiration and appreciation. But this atmosphere around him did not remain long, as we shall see. In the meantime Ibn Khaldun made the acquaintance of an emir of the court, named Ala al-Din al-Tinbugha al-Jawani who extended his patronage and helped him to be presented to the Sultan. Al-Zahir Barquq was then the Sultan of Egypt who ascended the throne a few days before the arrival of Ibn Khaldun (about the end of Ramadan, 784 A.H.). He welcomed the historian and took interest in him. Ibn Khaldun says: "He looked after my comfort, made me feel not as a stranger and granted me a liberal salary as he usually did for the *ulama*." Thus was realized the historian's desire to settle down and lead a quiet life under the patronage of a prince who would protect him and ensure his livelihood. Soon after the Sultan appointed him Professor in the Kamhiah School, close to the Mosque of Amr, a

* *Kitab Inba al-Ghumr fi Inba al-Umr* (manuscript in the Egyptian Library), Vol I, p. 711.

† *Kitab al-Dawu al-Lami*, Vol. II, Section II, p. 369.

Maliki institution. Ibn Khaldun does not omit to tell us about his first lecture in this school, which was attended by a large number of distinguished men sent by the Sultan, who surrounded the historian. Ibn Khaldun delivered in that gathering an eloquent speech which he records verbatim. He spoke of the merits of the *ulama* in supporting the Moslem state, of the rise of states, and went on to speak of the merits of the dynasties of Egyptian sultans in supporting Islam and increasing its power, of their interest in founding mosques and schools, of their patronage of science, the *ulama* and the judges. He then invoked God's blessing on Al-Malik al-Zahir and praised his justice and sagacity. He also alluded to himself and the honour given him by his appointment to the post, speaking in poetical words of his voyage from the West to the East, of the power and greatness of Islam and the flourishing intellectual movement, and expressing his thanks for the honour conferred upon him.

The gathering, which was attended by distinguished men and notables to hear the first lecture of the fertile thinker, presented a brilliant sight. Ibn Khaldun is careful to record it as he is careful to record the effect he believed to have made. He says: "The gathering broke up and I was bidden

good-bye with honour and respect."* This proves that Ibn Khaldun felt, with pride and confidence, that he was a distinguished personality entitled to special demonstrations of honour and respect. The second step was his success in obtaining government posts,—his appointment as Maliki Chief Justice about the end of Jumada II, 786 A.H. (August, 1384 A.D.) in place of Jamal al-Din ibn Khair al-Sakandari, who was relieved of his post. His promotion to this post, which is one of the four posts considered among the highest in the state, was the prelude to the storm which raged round him and the disputes which troubled the serenity of his life, undermined his influence and removed him, more than once, from his post. Ibn Khaldun writes with irony: "I continued my study and teaching till the Sultan, in one of his royal fits, was indignant against the then Maliki judge, removed him from his post and summoned me to his council, surrounded by emirs, to replace him. I declined the offer, but he insisted."† Ibn Khaldun knew all about those "royal fits" and that they often concealed more evil and vengeance than favour and sympathy. But he wishes us to understand that his rise to the post of judge was

* *Al-Taarif* (manuscript copy), p. 110.
† *Ibid.*, p. 111.

not only a royal fit, but he was chosen by the Sultan "for special merits and high prestige."

II

We can understand that the appointment of Ibn Khaldun to the post of judge was not an ordinary event. He was a foreigner, but rapidly advanced in the Sultan's favour, and in obtaining posts. The posts of professors and judges were always aspired after by the local *faqihs* and *ulama*; to confer these posts on newly arrived foreigners was thus a jest not welcomed by them. Therefore the learned Berber entered upon his duties in an atmosphere of rivalry and envy. He sat as a judge in the court of the Salhiah School in the district of Bein al-Qasrein, and soon after indications of spite and intrigue were noticed around him. Ibn Khaldun explains to us the cause of this storm. He tells us much about corruption and disorder in the Egyptian courts at that time, the partiality which characterized the judgments, the ignorance and corruption of most of the judges, *muftis*, clerks and witnesses, and that he tried to set up severe and impartial justice, vigorously put an end to corruption, and wipe out all sorts of intervention and passion. He says: "I assumed the charge of this honourable

post, and spared no effort to apply impartially the laws of God, undeterred either by influence or menace, treating both parties equally, setting up the right of the weak, ignoring intercession from both sides, taking care to verify evidence and to be sure of the honesty of the witnesses, for the good among them was mixed with the bad, while the authorities abstained from criticizing them and were indulgent towards their abuses, for they falsely pretended to be the protégés of the powerful, most of them mixing with princes and were Quran professors and *imams*, feigning to be just and therefore the princes considered them honest, and helped and intervened for them before the judges. It was a difficult problem; abuse spread owing to false evidence; I discovered some of the cases and inflicted heavy punishment..." Ibn Khaldun then enumerates the sort of evil he witnessed and which he tried to reform and suppress, and how he proceeded "with vigour and resolution", how he ignored the intercession of the notables and the high officials, which was against the tradition among his colleagues who accepted it. Indignation arose around him from all sides, and he was severely criticized and many intrigues were made against him in the court.*

* *Kitab al-Ibar*, Vol. VII, pp 453-54.

The explanation, Ibn Khaldun gives of the causes of the indignation against him, is reasonable and bears the stamp of clearness and truth; in fact, this is admitted by his Egyptian biographers, both contemporary and close to his age. Thus Abul Mahasin, for instance, says with regard to his administration of justice, that he "administered it with great dignity and capacity, that his prestige was high and that he ignored the recommendations of high officials and notables. They began to make a campaign against him."* Al-Sakhawi, quoting Ibn Hajar, says: "Ibn Khaldun treated people roughly; he did not rise when the judges came to salute him, excusing himself to those who blamed him. He punished many of the principal clerks and witnesses; he punished the contravention by boxes on the ears and imprisonment. When he was angry against some one he cried, 'Take him to prison', and he was then boxed till his neck was red from pain."†

Thus the storm broke out against Ibn Khaldun only a few months after his appointment, and there were so many intrigues and incitements against him that "the atmosphere between him and the

* *Al-Manhal al-Safi*, Vol II, p. 301

† Ibn Hajar in his *Rafi al-Isr an Kudat Misr* (manuscript in the Egyptian Library) in his biography of Ibn Khaldun, and Al-Sakhawi · *Al-Dawu al-Lami*, Vol II, Section II, p 367.

heads of the state was clouded," as he says, and he lost the sympathy and assistance he enjoyed. At that time another calamity befell him—the loss of his wife, children and property. Since his arrival, he expected his family to join him. But the Sultan of Tunis prevented their departure in order to oblige him to return. He asked Sultan Al-Zahir to intercede and allow his family to depart; his request was granted and the family sailed to Egypt. Ibn Khaldun records this calamity in the following words: "This coincided with the loss of my family and children. They sailed from Tunis in a ship which was drowned in a storm, and thus I lost my property, wife and children. The calamity was great; I was deeply affected and felt inclined to abandon the world and to resign my post." Not long after, the historian was removed from his post of judge; in other words he was dismissed. But he wishes us to understand that his dismissal was in accordance with his wishes. He says: "The Sultan was kind enough to cover me with his sympathy and relieved me of a charge I could not bear, and, as some pretended, I could not properly discharge. He restored to the post its former titular and liberated me from its fetter. I departed leaving the best memory, the public expressing their regret, good wishes and thanks, as well as their sympathy

and the hope of seeing me return." In short Ibn Khaldun assures us that his dismissal was only the result of prejudice, spite and intrigue, and that it raised indignation and regret in the Cairo society, and that he left his post preserving all his dignity. We shall, however, see that, as he said before, he was accused of ignorance of the law and its procedure, that he was not fit to fill the post of judge, and that he passionately coveted the post.

Ibn Khaldun was relieved for the first time of his post of judge in Jumada I, 787 A.H. (July, 1385 A.D.), that is to say, only a year after his appointment. He then again devoted all his time to study and writing.

The dismissal of Ibn Khaldun did not, however, mean that he lost the Sultan's favour, for he continued as lecturer in the Kamhiah School. Not long after the Sultan appointed him Professor of Maliki jurisprudence at the new school he founded in the district of Bein al-Qasrein (the Zahiriah Barquqiah School). As usual Ibn Khaldun's first lecture was attended with ceremony. He delivered an eloquent speech, in which he prayed God for the Sultan, and apologized for his scanty knowledge in charming modesty. He continued to lecture in the two schools till the approach of the pilgrimage season in the year 789 A.H. when he

decided to visit the Holy Land. The Sultan granted his request and made him a good donation. He left Cairo in the middle of Shaaban and went to Hejaz by sea, and, on the accomplishment of the pilgrimage, returned again by sea as far as Kosseir whence he crossed Upper Egypt by way of the Nile and reached Cairo in Jumada I, 790 A.H. He went direct to the Sultan and told him that he had offered up prayers for him in the holy places. The Sultan received him kindly. The post of lecturer on Hadith was then vacant in the Sarghatmash School,* and the Sultan appointed him to it instead of lecturing on jurisprudence in the Sultaniah School. He began his lectures in the month of Moharram, 791 A.H. and, as usual, delivered the opening lecture to a notable gathering. He announced his decision that *Kitab al-Muwata* by Imam Malik was the text-book to be studied. He tells us of the subject of his first lecture on that day—he spoke of Malik, his origin, his life and the diffusion of his doctrines—and concludes with his usual pride: "The gathering ended, and I was looked upon with reverence, and my fitness for high posts impressed all minds, both high and low sincerely recognizing this fact."†

* The school was situated to the north of Ibn Tulun Mosque near the citadel.

† *Al-Taarif* (manuscript copy), p. 121.

III

The historian was then appointed Shaikh (manager) of the Beibers Sufi Institute *(Khanqah)*, the greatest of its kind of that age. His salary was raised and his resources were increased, but his tranquillity did not last long. There was a big conspiracy which carried away the throne of Al-Zahir Barquq; its hero and organizer was Emir Yalbugha al-Nasiri, ruler of Aleppo. The organization and circumstances of the Cairo court, and intrigues and treacherous acts raging in it, allowed the repetition of such conspiracies. Yalbugha al-Nasiri was previously Viceroy of the Kingdom and leader of a strong party of emirs and knights among whom was Al-Zahir Barquq. Barquq, however, succeeded in a previous conspiracy (Ramadan, 784 A.H.), to capture the throne, deprive him of authority and influence and deport him to Syria. An opportunity then presented itself to Yalbugha to revolt. He marched on Cairo with his followers, and Barquq having been abandoned by his supporters, fled from the citadel; thus Yalbugha al-Nasiri entered Cairo and restored Al-Salih Haji, the former Sultan, to the throne. He arrested Barquq and sent him as a prisoner to Al-Karak

(Jumada I, 791 A.H.). But another revolt arose, led by another emir called Mintash, who arrested Al-Nasiri, and marched on Damascus to fight Barquq who had escaped from prison. Barquq defeated him, returned victorious to Cairo and recaptured his throne in Safar, 792 A.H., only a few months after his dethronement. Ibn Khaldun devotes in his autobiography a chapter to these events,* and begins it with a philosophical-social exposition in which he speaks of the rise of states through their vitality (*Al-Asabiyah*), the extension of their possessions, and the overflow of civilization and luxury on them, the rise of their powerful leaders who diffused in them a new spirit of vigour, and, lastly, the repetition of this phenomenon. He then applies this theory to the Egyptian dynasties since the days of Salah al-Din (Saladin) and concisely gives their history. Here we see Ibn Khaldun, as we see him in his Prolegomena, a social philosopher who explains phenomena and beings, and understands them through the light of historical events.

It seems that Ibn Khaldun suffered from this upheaval. He lost all or some of his posts and income by the downfall of the party whose patronage

* *Al-Taarif* (manuscript copy), p. 122 and the following ; and Makrizi : *Al-Khitat* (Bulak), Vol. II, p. 242.

he enjoyed. When Al-Zahir Barquq returned to the throne he restored him all that he had lost, as is proved by his comment on the return of Al-Zahir: "God then restored him to his throne to manage the affairs of the nation, and bestowed on him the same honour as he had before, and the Sultan restored to me his previous favours."*

For some years Ibn Khaldun devoted his time to research and study. He stops in recording his life at this stage till the beginning of 797 A.H. in the current biography annexed to his History. He continues this autobiography some more stages in the manuscript copy referred to above, and gives details of his life till the close of 807 A.H., that is to say, only a few months before his death. The manuscript copy gives more details even in the stages which concord with those of the printed copy. It was for this reason that we preferred to consult the manuscript copy in addition to the printed one in all matters where more details are given. But the manuscript copy will henceforth be our only source in all details of the historian's life.

In this interval there is nothing in the life of Ibn Khaldun which is worthy to record, except his attempt to conclude relations between the court of Cairo and the Sultans of North Africa. Ibn

* *Kitab al-Ibar*, Vol. VII, p. 462.

Khaldun speaks concisely of these royal relations and describes the correspondence and presents between Salah al-Din and Banu Abd al-Mumin (the Almohades), kings of North Africa, and between Al-Nasir Kalawun and the kings of Banu Mareen. He describes the Egyptian and the Moorish presents and refers to his efforts to conclude relations between Al-Malik al-Zahir and the Sultan of Tunis. The purport of these efforts is that he wrote to the Sultan of Tunis urging him to send a present to the King of Egypt. He sent him, as a present, a number of rare horses, but they were drowned with the ship which was carrying the historian's family, as already said. Al-Malik al-Zahir returned the compliment, and sent a present to the Sultan of Tunis. He then sent in the year 799 A.H. envoys to purchase a number of horses, and Ibn Khaldun gave them instructions and recommendations, but they returned with a magnificent present which the Sultan of Tunis had prepared but was delayed, and several other presents by the emirs of North Africa, including magnificent horses and a number of gilt saddles. Ibn Khaldun describes the day on which the presents were offered and exposed, and tells us that he felt that day proud and honoured, "owing to the success of his efforts to conclude permanent relations between those kings".

CHAPTER VII

In Damascus and in the camp of Timur

The return of Ibn Khaldun to the post of judge. Death of Sultan Barquq and the accession of Al-Nasir Faraj Ibn Khaldun's visit to Palestine. His dismissal from the post of judge The invasion of Syria by the Tartars. Al-Nasir Faraj marches to meet the invaders. Ibn Khaldun accompanies him to Damascus. His sudden return to Egypt. Ibn Khaldun descends from the wall of Damascus and marches to the camp of Timur. His account of meeting the invader His interview with Timur. His treatise on the geography of North Africa He discusses the question of Caliphate with the invader Ibn Khaldun's present to Timur. His peace negotiations. The reports of Makrizi, Ibn Iyas and Ibn Arabshah. Ibn Khaldun asks the conqueror to allow him to depart. His return to Egypt. He attempts to return to the post of judge. His third appointment to this post The intrigues raging around him. The climax of the struggle between him and his rivals Successive appointments and dismissals. Death of Ibn Khaldun.

I

IBN KHALDUN was kept away from the post of judge for about fourteen years; there stood between him and this post, as he says, that party of the court which was intriguing against him, and incited the Sultan to dismiss him. When that party lost its influence and its leaders vanished, the Sultan took the first opportunity to restore him

to his post. This happened in the middle of Ramadan, 801 A.H. (May, 1398 A.D.), on the death of Nasir al-Din al-Tansi, the Maliki judge. At that time Ibn Khaldun was in Fayum looking after the harvest of the crop of his farm, endowed to him by the Wakfs of the Kamhiah School. The Sultan summoned him and appointed him judge for the second time. Not long after the Sultan died in the middle of Shawwal, and was succeeded by his son Al-Nasir Faraj. The affairs of the state were disturbed and for some time there were local revolts and revolutions. When the matters were somewhat settled, the historian applied for permission to go to Jerusalem which was granted, and Ibn Khaldun roamed about in the holy city visiting its old monuments. He visited Al-Masjid al-Aqsa, the tomb of Al-Khalil and the monuments of Bethlehem, but he refused to enter the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. He tells us: "This building raised by the Christian nations on the spot where Christ was supposed to be crucified did not appeal to me and I refused to enter it." He then returned and joined the Sultan's procession which was returning from Syria, at the outskirts of Egypt and entered Cairo with him about the end of Ramadan, 802 A.H.

In Moharram, 803 A.H., Ibn Khaldun was relieved of his post of judge for the second time.

We shall see that his dismissal was the result of organized efforts of the historian's adversaries, and that its repetition was a remarkable manifestation of the struggle between him and his adversaries in and out of the court. Not long after news was received that Timur* had invaded Syria with his forces and captured the city of Aleppo amid horrible sights of bloodshed and destruction (Rabi I, 803 A.H., 1400 A.D.)† and that he had crossed to southern Syria as far as Damascus. This news alarmed Egypt and the court was greatly disturbed. Al-Nasir Faraj hastened with his forces to meet and repulse the Tartar invader, being accompanied by the four judges and a number of *faqihs* and sufis among whom was Ibn Khaldun. There is no doubt that Ibn Khaldun was not pleased with this surprise which reminded him of all he suffered in North Africa from these dangerous royal missions. He tells us plainly that he tried to elude this voyage, had not Yashbak, the Sultan's chamberlain, persuaded him with honied words and valuable presents.‡ The historian devotes a chapter to the events of this expedition, and prefaces it with an

* Commonly known in English by the name of Tamerlane.

† For the details of the conquest of Aleppo see Al-Makrizi : *Al-Suluk fi Duwal al-Muluk* (manuscript in the Egyptian Library), Vol. III, p. 23.

‡ *Al-Taarif* (MS.) Al-Makrizi says that the Sultan gave express orders to Yashbak to force Ibn Khaldun to depart. (*Al-Suluk*, Vol. III, p. 24).

account of the rise of the Tartars and the Seljukes. The expedition marched in Rabi II, 803 A.H. and arrived in Damascus in Jumada I. Ibn Khaldun and the *faqihs* and *ulama* stayed at Adiliah School. The Egyptian troops were soon engaged with the invader near Damascus in local battles in which the Egyptians maintained their posts. Peace negotiations now began between the two sides, but owing to dissension in the Sultan's camp some of the emirs secretly left for Egypt. The Sultan learned that they had planned a plot to dethrone him and place on the throne another emir called Lashin. He therefore left Damascus to its fate and hastened to Cairo where he arrived in Jumada II.* Soon after the commanders and the leaders disagreed on the capitulation of the city. Here we find the historian impelled by the spirit of adventure as well as by egoism. He was afraid that the city would fall into the hands of the invader when he would be killed or tortured. He resorted to audacity and decided to abandon the hesitant commanders and go to the invader's camp to ask him to spare his life and ensure his fortune. The historian speaks frankly on the subject, and, commenting on the disagreement between the commanders, says: " I heard the news, and apprehended the consequences, so I went

* *Al-Suluk*, Vol. II, p. 26.

at the dawn to meet the judges at the door and, being alarmed, asked either to be allowed to go out or to be hanged down from the wall."* The historian managed to convince his colleagues who hauled him down from the wall. At the door he met some of Timur's suite and his son Shah Malik, who had been appointed Governor of Damascus (when it capitulates), and joined them. He asked to be allowed to meet Timur, and they accompanied him to the camp and at once introduced him to the invader in his tent. Ibn Khaldun describes this famous interview; he says: "I entered the tent where he was sitting, inclining on his elbow, while the dishes were being carried before him to excite the appetite of the Mongol troops sitting in circles before his tent. When I entered I bowed and made signs of submission. He raised his head and extended his hand which I kissed. He ordered me to sit down and I did so where I was. He then summoned one of his suite, Abd al-Jabbar ibn al-Numan, a Hanafite *faqih* from Khuwarazm, to interpret between us."†

The invader had a long talk with the historian; he inquired about his affairs and his news, and the reason of his coming from Egypt and all that

* *Al-Taarif*, manuscript copy.
† *Ibid*

happened to him there. He also asked him about North Africa, its cities, affairs and Sultans, and ordered him to write for him a treatise describing North Africa. The historian told him that he had heard of him and for forty years longed to see him, that is to say, since the rise of his star and the spread of his renown. He also explained to him some of his social theories about the vitality of the state and sovereignty. There is no doubt that there was a negotiation on the subject of the city between the historian and the invader, in which the former was able to convince the chiefs and *faqihs* of the necessity of capitulation, for Damascus soon after opened its doors before the invader. The judges and chiefs, headed by the historian, went to Timur's camp to offer submission. Ibn Khaldun tells us that Timur dismissed them but kept him for some time. He then retired, and for some days was busy writing the treatise describing North Africa, which as he says, when completed, was in twelve small books. He presented it to Timur who ordered it to be translated into the Mongolian language.*

* This treatise is unknown to us, but it is most probable that it was nothing but a detailed account of what he wrote on the subject in his great History, in the part reserved for the history of the Berbers, where he prefaced it with a general geographical description of Barbary; see *Kitab al-Ibar*, Vol. VI, p. 98 and the following.

It was understood that Damascus would escape the invader's revenge by surrendering but, on the pretext that the fort continued to oppose, the Tartars tightened the blockade till it surrendered, and they stormed the city, arrested many of the inhabitants and committed murder, havoc and pillage and set fire to most of its districts; the terrible scenes which took place in Aleppo were repeated here. Ibn Khaldun did not, however, sever his relations with the invader but continued to be in touch with him, and often visited him in the course of this calamity. Timur, in his conversation with the historian, told him of the case of a certain person who presented himself to him pretending to be the Caliph and to be a descendant of the Abbasides. There were long legal discussions on this subject in which the historian took part and expressed his opinions on the Caliphate. Ibn Khaldun also offered the invader a present composed of "a beautiful copy of the Quran, a splendid rug, a copy of the Burda ode, and four boxes of delicious Egyptian sweets". When he presented them Timur raised the Quran over his head, when he knew it was the holy book; he then inquired about the Burda, tasted the sweets and gave some to those present. The historian asked Timur for an "*aman*" (guarantee of safety) for the judges,

chiefs and officials, which was granted and the "*aman*" issued.

This is the story of Ibn Khaldun's relations with the Tartar invader, and his conversations and interviews with him. Here he played the role of the old politician. But another great Egyptian contemporary historian, Al-Makrizi, gives us a different account of these events. He tells us that it was judge Taqi al-Din ibn Muflih al-Hanbali who negotiated with Timur on the capitulation of Damascus; he was sent by the chiefs to the invader in response to his request to conclude peace when he failed to storm the city, and that Ibn Muflih used all his influence to convince the chiefs to surrender; also, that it was he who was let down outside the wall with a number of notables and *faqihs*, accompanied them to the invader's camp, concluded peace with him and obtained the "*aman*", and, lastly, that he undertook to execute all his desires in collecting money and booty. But Timur soon after broke his promise, for he arrested Ibn Muflih and his companions, and his troops stormed the city and looted and set it to fire.* This report is confirmed by another Egyptian historian, Ibn Iyas, who tells us that the chiefs chose Ibn Muflih to negotiate because of his

* *Al-Suluk,* Vol. II, Section II, p. 27.

knowledge of the Turkish language.* Al-Makrizi however confirms the report of Ibn Khaldun in another part of his book and says: " When he knew that the Sultan had departed, he let himself down from the wall of the city and went to Timur, who honoured him, ordered him to sit down and lodged him; he then gave him permission to return to Egypt, which he did." He afterwards says that Timur issued for him the edict of journey and released, through his intervention, a number of captives.† Ibn Khaldun says plainly in his report that it was he who negotiated and intervened for the conclusion of the armistice between the invader and the inhabitants of Damascus, as already said, and that he represented the chiefs and the judges before Timur. We do not doubt his statement. This is also the report of Ibn Arabshah, Timur's historian, who wrote his history soon after these events. He describes how Ibn Khaldun met the invader under the walls of Damascus, at the head of the *ulama* and the judges, and describes in charming, poetic words the interview verbatim.‡ The authenticity of this report does not however contradict the fact that Ibn Muflih may have

* Ibn Iyas : *Tarikh Misr* (Bulak), Vol. I, pp. 331-32.

† *Al-Suluk*, Vol. II, p. 28.

‡ Ibn Arabshah *Ajaib al-Makdur* (Cairo), p. 123 and the following.

taken part in the negotiations and undertaken the execution of the conditions of the capitulation.

Perhaps Ibn Khaldun had, with regard to his relations with the invader, hopes other than those in which he was successful, with regard to Damascus and his colleagues the *ulama* and judges. Perhaps he may have expected to be attached to the conqueror's suite, to gain his favour and patronage. But there is no doubt that he did not succeed to realize such aspirations, for a few weeks after he was weary of his sojourn in Damascus, and applied to Timur for permission to return to Egypt. Timur gave him permission, and, in that audience, asked Ibn Khaldun to present him with a mule, if possible, and the historian presented one to him. Timur later sent him its price soon after his return to Egypt. The historian left Damascus in Rajab, 803 A.H., only two months after his arrival there. He was attacked on the way by thieves who robbed him of his money and effects, but he arrived in Cairo safely early in Shaaban, 803 A.H. Here the historian exclaims satisfaction with his escape: "I thanked God for my safety," and tells us that he wrote to the Sultan of Tunis, his old patron, speaking of these events, as well as of his interviews with Timur, and describing the invader, his great power and vast Kingdom.

II

As soon as Ibn Khaldun settled down in Cairo he tried to return to the post of judge. We have seen that he continued to occupy the chair of lecturer in one or two schools. But judgeship is a post of influence and authority, and Ibn Khaldun felt in that atmosphere of dispute and rivalry, that he was in need of the influence he used to enjoy in all his relations with the Sultan. The struggle about this post, the demonstration of which we saw in his successive appointments and dismissals, undoubtedly inflamed his passion to obtain his post; this would be the symbol of his triumph over his adversaries and rivals. At that time the historian was seventy-four years old and his ambitous soul always aspired after a position of influence and honour. An Egyptian impartial historian describes for us this mentality in a few words. He says at the conclusion of the historian's biography: " May God have mercy upon him. How fond he was of office!"* But besides this passion for office, there was a struggle between Ibn Khaldun and his adversaries. The post of judge was, as we shall see,

* Abul Mahasin: *Al-Manhal al-Safi*, Vol. II, p. 301.

the cause of this struggle. Ibn Khaldun was raised to it whenever he was able to retrieve his influence in the court and to overcome the intrigues of his enemies, and he lost it when his adversaries succeeded in their intrigues against him.

Ibn Khaldun was relieved of the post of judge for the second time in Moharram, 803 A.H., and he was out of office when he joined the Sultan's suite in his journey to Syria. His adversaries availed themselves of his absence to intrigue against him, and some even said that he met his death in the events of Damascus.* The historian here wishes us to understand that the post was reserved for him, or, at least, that he was promised to be reappointed to it by the authorities. He tells us that, in consequence of this intrigue, a Maliki judge, Jamal al-Din al-Ikfihsi, was appointed in his place (Jumada II, 803 A.H.). When he returned to Cairo this appointment was cancelled and Al-Ikfihsi was dismissed; Ibn Khaldun was appointed for the third time about the end of Shaaban or early in Ramadan. He remained in this post for about a year, working in an atmosphere tense with intrigues and disputes, but he tells us that, as usual, he took no pains to flatter the notables and that he continued, as before, " administering right and taking no heed

* *Al-Taarif*, manuscript copy.

of personal interests". The old intrigues again played around him and he was bitterly attacked; the fight led to the usual issue and the historian was again relieved of his office on Rajab 14, 804 A.H. and was replaced about the end of Rajab by Jamal al-Din al-Busati who had previously held this post. It seems that the fight was, this time, more explicit, and that Ibn Khaldun suffered more than ever by the attacks of his adversaries, so that, when dismissed, he was summoned to appear before the great Hajib to answer many charges. On this subject Ibn Hajar and Al-Sakhawi say: "Several charges were brought against Ibn Khaldun, many of which were false, and he was grossly insulted."* Here the fight between the historian and his adversaries was intensified, and became a violent struggle with immediate consequences, its manifestation being exchanging the post of judge. But, for a time, it was limited to Ibn Khaldun and Al-Busati, which proves that the latter represented the party hostile to the historian in this phase of the struggle. It also appears that Ibn Khaldun relied, in opposing his adversaries, on factors and forces not less effective than those they relied upon. Hardly three months after his appoint-

* Ibn Hajar: *Raf al-Isr an Kudat Misr*, p. 159, quoted by Al-Sakhawi in *Al-Dawu al-Lami*.

ment, Al-Busati was relieved from the post early in Zul-Hijja, and Ibn Khaldun appointed for the fourth time on 16th Zul-Hijja. He remained a year and two months in this post, but his adversaries were again stronger and he was dismissed (7th Rabi I, 806 A.H.) and Al-Busati restored to the post in the same month. He was, however, dismissed again in Rajab, 807, and Ibn Khaldun restored to the post for the fifth time in Shaaban, 807. Three months after, on 26th Zul-Kaada of the same year, he was dismissed, and replaced by his old rival Jamal al-Din al-Ikfihsi who occupied the post for three months, and was dismissed and replaced by Jamal al-Din al-Tansi for only two days. Al-Busati was then restored in Rabi I, 808, and dismissed in Shaaban of the same year. Ibn Khaldun was restored to the post for the sixth time but occupied it for only a few weeks.* On Ramadan 26, 808 A.H. (March 16, 1406 A.D.) the great historian and thinker, as Maliki judge, died in the seventy-eighth year of his age after a brilliant life crowded with great events, and striking thought and originality. He was buried in the Sufi cemetery outside Bab

* For the phases of this struggle and the exchange of appointment and dismissal see Ibn Khaldun's *Al-Taarif* (manuscript copy, p. 147); Al-Suyuti; *Husn al-Mohadara* (Cairo), Vol. II, p. 123; and *Al-Manhal al-Safi*, Vol. II, p. 301. There are slight differences in the dates of these reports.

al-Nasr,* which at that time was the burial ground for important persons and the *ulama.* Ibn Khaldun's record of the news of this astonishing struggle ends with his dismissal for the fifth time in Zul-Kaada, 807 A.H., that is to say, only a few months before his death.

* Al-Sakhawi. *Al-Dawu al-Lami*, Vol. II, Part II, p. 370.

CHAPTER VIII

Ibn Khaldun and Egyptian thought

Ibn Khaldun keeps away from politics in Egypt. His literary output in this interval. Ibn Khaldun's opinion of the Egyptians. The seeds of dispute between him and the society of Cairo Egyptian writers attack him. The attitude of Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar and others with regard to him and his work. Al-Sakhawi's criticism. The Egyptian writers who support him. Al-Makrizi is influenced by his thought and theories. The theories of Al-Makrizi as to the causes of the calamities which befell Egypt. Abul Mahasin praises Ibn Khaldun. Ibn Khaldun's life in Egypt. His seclusion and moral pains. Where Ibn Khaldun lived in Cairo? Where is his tomb?

I

IBN KHALDUN spent twenty-three years in Egypt (784-808 A.H.) but, of all the stages of his life, they were the least eventful, the least fruitful.

As for events, the stormy political life of Ibn Khaldun in North Africa in the course of which he went through a vast field of grave adventures and intrigues, and suffered much adversity as well as often enjoyed posts of influence and authority is, in fact, a vivid, sensational page of the

history of North Africa in the middle of the eighth century A.H.—this stormy life the historian replaced by a quieter one in Egypt. In Egypt Ibn Khaldun lived as an ordinary personality who had nothing to do with the great affairs of the state, after having spent a quarter of a century in North Africa as their moving spirit. He divested himself of the garb of the political adventurer to wear the robe of the great scholar, and to derive his limited influence from this quality. In this interval the historian, however, met with two of the most important events of his life, we mean the loss of his family and his meeting with the Tartar invader Timur.

As for his literary output we have seen that the historian accomplished the greatest work of his life —we mean his voluminous History and his excellent Prolegomena—before he arrived in Egypt. We have no knowledge of his having written any work during his sojourn in Egypt; but there is no doubt that having easy access to libraries and books of reference he had the opportunity to correct, polish and add to his History and Prolegomena. We shall see in another chapter that he continued to revise his work and make many additions to it, particularly with regard to the history of Moslem kingdoms in the East, the North African states and Andalusia of his time, and recorded the events of

his age to the close of the eighth century, after having stopped at the year 873 A.H., the year he finished his work. The historian also continued to write his autobiography during his sojourn in Egypt, almost to the last hour of his life, embodying new chapters on the characteristics of the Egyptian Mameluke dynasties and the origin of the Tartars, and wrote, while in Syria, a description of the countries of North Africa and presented it to Timur, as already said. There is no doubt Ibn Khaldun also diffused in his lectures and conversations his social principles and opinions.

It appears, however, that Ibn Khaldun could not create in Egypt a real school stamped with his opinions and methods. It was natural that he should have created such a school in a country where he devoted his time to research and study for long years. It is true the Egyptian contemporary thought does not lack the influence of Ibn Khaldun, as we shall see. But this influence which should have flourished in Egypt and spread in its historical school, at that time very famous, was small and limited in extent. This fact could be attributed to the spirit with which the historian was received by the intellectual society of Egypt—a spirit of dislike and hostility. Before Ibn Khaldun arrived in Egypt, he was preceded by his opinion

against the Egyptians in his Prolegomena—"a nation inclined to merriment, frivolity and disregard of consequences."* This remark Ibn Khaldun makes in speaking of the influence of climate on the character of people and considers it the result of Egypt being situated in the tropical zone. But although this remark may seem to be the result of scientific research, it could not be received by those against whom it was made without dissatisfaction and spite. It was natural that this evil seed should produce a bad effect on the feelings of the Egyptian society towards the historian. This society itself was raging with elements of dispute and rivalry, and its leaders were imbued with mutual ill feeling and hostility. The rivalry between the masters of thought and literature of that time, whether in the field of superior production or for attaining influence and wealth through intellectual leadership, was a manifestation of this dispute. Egyptian literary society was then divided into several factions each of which sided with some leader or a party of leaders whose literary efforts they supported and whose adversaries they fought in the field of controversy. It was thus not easy for a foreigner like Ibn Khaldun, who came to join this society and to seek influence and living, to enjoy a quiet

* *The Prolegomena*, p. 73.

atmosphere or be met with friendship, not to speak of his vehemence, severity and pride which added to the enmity and spite surrounding him.

It was natural that the opinions and views of Ibn Khaldun should meet, in this troubled atmosphere, with indifference and criticism more than with popularity and appreciation, and that they should have a limited diffusion and impression. Yet a number of Egyptian thinkers and scholars of note attended his lectures and profited by them, and we can perceive their effects in some of the fruits of contemporary Egyptian thought. Among those who attended his lectures was Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqulani, the great Hadith scholar and historian. He tells us in his book "the Judges of Egypt" that he often met Ibn Khaldun and profited by his knowledge and works, particularly his History, and that he was very eloquent, a good essayist, a poet of medium ability with profound knowledge, particularly of the affairs of the state, and that he was a good critic of poetry although not a great poet.* But Ibn Hajar violently attacks Ibn Khaldun and cites in his biography many of the statements made against him. He tells us in his history that Ibn Khaldun was an able historian,

* *Raf al-Isr* (manuscript copy) p. 160, also quoted by Al-Sakhawi in *Al-Dawu al-Lami*.

but he was not well acquainted with the true annals, particularly those of the East, and disagrees with Al-Makrizi in his praise of the Prolegomena, and says that all that distinguishes it is rhetoric, play on the words on the method of Al-Jahiz, and that its merits are few, but rhetoric embellishes its contents so as to seem excellent although they are not. As for Ibn Khaldun in the capacity of judge, Ibn Hajar tells us that he administered justice with severity and in a manner unusual in Egypt, and when appointed to this post he treated people coldly and punished many of the senior clerks and witnesses, and that he was dismissed for the first time for committing forgery in a document. Here he cites much of what was said criticizing and discrediting the historian, such as: " When the inhabitants of North Africa heard of his appointment to the post of judge they were astonished and attributed want of knowledge to the Egyptians. Thus Ibn Arafa said: ' We had always considered judgeship one of the highest posts, but when he was appointed we considered it the lowest'." Al-Rikraki, one of the senior clerks, who worked with Ibn Khaldun, says that he was ignorant of the *Sharia* (Moslem Law). Ibn Hajar also cites certain personal and moral attacks made against the historian, such as that quoted from Al-Aintabi, to

the effect that he was accused of improper charges, and that (quoted from the book of the judges by Al-Bishbishi) "in his last years Ibn Khaldun was fond of hearing lady-singers, of mixing with young men, and that he married a woman who had a beautiful brother of doubtful morality." Also that "he often despised people, that he was polite only when out of office, but, when in office, he was rough and vehement, in fact, no one would treat him or see him". These statements reveal a profound antagonism and exaggerated depreciation which descends to mere defamation. Bishbishi* was no doubt one of the bitterest and severest adversaries of the historian, and recorded his attacks in a book he wrote on the history of the judges; this book has not come down to us, but Ibn Hajar quotes from it those biting personal passages. Finally Ibn Hajar says that Ibn Khaldun always adhered to his Moorish garb, and refused to wear the judges' dress only because he was fond of behaving differently in everything.†

* Jamal al-Din Abdulla al-Bishbishi was born in 762 A.H. in the village of Bishbish, Gharbia Province, and died in 820 A.H. He was a great Shafi *faqih* (jurist) and a famous man of letters. He was for a time manager of the *Hisba* (public prosecutor) in Cairo. See his biography in *Al-Dawu al-Lami*, Vol. II, Part III, p 511

† For all these quotations see Ibn Hajar. *Inba al-Ghumr* (manuscript copy), Vol. I, p. 711; and *Raf al-Isr* in his biography of Ibn Khaldun, pp. 158-60.

The attitude of Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar towards Ibn Khaldun and his work calls for reflection. In spite of his sobriety, moderation and reserve, he resorts here to a sort of defamation and depreciation unusual in his writings. There is no doubt that his tone and statements are characterized by exaggeration and partiality. But there is no doubt also, that they have their value in the appreciation of contemporary Egyptian public opinion of Ibn Khaldun. In fact they could be considered as representing the opinion of the intellectual group who declared war against the historian and severely discredited and attacked him. This was, no doubt, the stronger party, because it included many prominent thinkers and *faqihs*, such as Ibn Hajar, Jamal al-Din al-Bishbishi, Al-Rikraki and Badr al-Din al-Aini (Al-Aintabi). The echo of this literary dispute resounded all through the ninth century A.H. when Al-Sakhawi came towards the end of this century, and repeated all that his *shaikh* (professor) Ibn Hajar said and quoted against Ibn Khaldun and his work, but in a bitter biting tone revealing more ill will and intention to discredit and demolish than an attempt to right criticism. This same spirit is evident in his biographical dictionary (*Al-Dawu al-Lami*) in the biographies of most of the outstanding personalities. Yet, he admits, in one

of his other books, the excellence of the Prolegomena and is more moderate and appreciative.*

II

On the other hand Ibn Khaldun gained the admiration of another strong group of the Egyptian thinkers. At the head of this group stood the great historian Taqi al-Din al-Makrizi. In his youth Makrizi attended the lectures of Ibn Khaldun and admired his vast erudition, his interesting lectures and original views and opinions. Al-Makrizi speaks of his *shaikh*, Ibn Khaldun, with the greatest respect and veneration, and calls him "our master, the great scholar, and professor, the chief justice".† In his book entitled *Al-Suluk* he describes Ibn Khaldun's life in Egypt and Syria, and in his book *Durar al-Uqud al-Farida* gives his detailed biography with admiration, and is very enthusiastic in his appreciation of the Prolegomena. He says: "It is unique of its kind, an accomplishment too difficult to realize; in fact it is the essence of knowledge and science and the result of a sane mind. It reveals the truth of things,

* *Kitab al-Ilan bil-Tawbikh* (Cairo), p. 151.
† *Al-Khitat*, Vol. II, pp. 67 and 190.

events and news; it explains the state of the universe and reveals the origin of all beings in an admirable, plain style."* This estimation is contradicted by Ibn Hajar who with his disciple, Al-Sakhawi, blame Al-Makrizi for his impartial attitude towards Ibn Khaldun, and accuse him of exaggeration and excess of admiration and veneration. Ibn Hajar explains this attitude by the fact that Al-Makrizi was a Fatimide while Ibn Khaldun supported the authenticity of their origin. He then goes on to tell us that Al-Makrizi did not understand the object of Ibn Khaldun, for, being an antagonist of the family of Ali, he supports the lineage of the Fatimides owing to the fact that the Fatimides were accused of heresy and that some of them pretended to be of a divine nature.

Al-Makrizi not only highly praised and appreciated Ibn Khaldun but was also much impressed by his theories, as is evident in his book *Ighathat al-Umma bi-Kashf al-Ghumma* of which we have a single manuscript copy in the Egyptian Library.†

In this book, which he says he revised in one single night of Moharram, 808 A.H., and in which

* Only a small part of *Durur al-Uqud al-Farida* has come down to us. We rely here on the quotation of Al-Sakhawi and Ibn Hajar from Al-Makrizi in *Al-Dawu al-Lami*, *Raf al-Isr* and *Inba al-Ghumr*.

† This book has now been published by Lajnat al-Talif wal-Tarjama, Cairo, 1940.

he speaks of the calamities of Egypt from the earliest time to his days, Al-Makrizi, in his exposition and reasoning, adopts the method of his master Ibn Khaldun as in Prolegomena. He prefaces his treatise by a short comparison between the past and the present, and a short account of the misfortunes of the high cost of living and the scarcity of water, which befell Egypt from the deluge to his time. He then devotes a chapter to the causes which led to these misfortunes, and to their continuation for so long. In this chapter we see plainly the method of Ibn Khaldun in research and explanation. In fact, we see Al-Makrizi using the words and expressions of his master, such as " the conditions of existence and the nature of society " etc. According to Makrizi the causes of ruin and misfortune are:

I. Corruption in filling high posts of the state, both civil and religious, and their occupation by the despot and the ignorant.

II. The high lease of lands and increase in the cost of production over the price of the crops.

III. Depreciated coins.

The above is followed by a treatise on the history of currency in the Moslem states and in Egypt.

He then speaks of the classes of society and the conditions of people and divides the Egyptian

society into seven classes:

1. The officials of the state.

2. The wealthy merchants and the well-to-do (the aristocracy).

3. The shop-keepers or middle-class merchants and the workers (the commonplace).

4. The farmers, the peasants and the rural population.

5. The poor, including most of the *faqihs* and students.

6. The businessmen, artisans and liberal professions.

7. The vagabonds, the extremely poor who live by mendicity

Al-Makrizi speaks of the condition of each class in detail, and goes on to tell us of the prices particularly those of foodstuffs, and concludes with his opinion on how these misfortunes should be remedied, which is to change the system of currency and use only currency of stable value such as gold and silver; this is the very idea of the stabilization of currency.

This is Al-Makrizi's method of explanation and reasoning. Thus we see the influence of the historian evident in the method of his disciple, and we can find much similarity between the statements of Al-Makrizi in his treatise and the chapters Ibn

Khaldun wrote in his Prolegomena on the nature of sovereignty and the factors of its decline, the currency, the effect of taxes on the state and the effect of injustice on the destruction of civilization, and how anarchy creeps into the state, and is overcome by the excess of civilization, high cost of living, famine, and other matters connected with the decay and downfall of the state.* We can even see this influence in some of the writings of Al-Sakhawi in his book *Al-Ilan bil-Tawbikh*, dealing with the value of history, and its effects in studying the conditions of nations. Here also, in spite of his controversy with Ibn Khaldun, Al-Sakhawi is influenced by his philosophical theory in explaining and understanding history.

There is also another Egyptian historian, Abul Mahasin ibn Taghri Birdi, who shares with his master Al-Makrizi his appreciation of Ibn Khaldun and praises his abilities and impartiality when he was judge. He tells us that he administered justice with high prestige and great dignity and was appreciated by all.

The influence of Ibn Khaldun is also evident from the fact that a number of great Egyptian contemporary writers consulted and quoted his

* See this chapter in the Prolegomena, pp. 140-41, 157-58, 217-20, 246, 252

Prolegomena and History, such as Abul Abbas al-Qalqashandi, author of *Subh al-Aasha*, who quotes Ibn Khaldun on various occasions in his work.

III

This is a minute comprehensive picture of the life of Ibn Khaldun in Egypt, his relations with its public life and influence on its contemporary intellectual movement.

This interval in the life of the historian, lasting twenty-three years, is different in manner and conditions from his life in North Africa. There he lived principally as statesman, successively occupying posts of distinction in the Berber states and courts, and taking part in endless intrigues and adventures. But in Egypt he lived as a scholar and judge, and if we exclude his negotiations with Timur in the events of Damascus, and his efforts to establish relations between the court of Cairo and the Sultans of North Africa he had no chance to play a role worthy of mention in the course of Egyptian politics. If Ibn Khaldun has also taken part in intrigues in Egypt, the conflict was local, of limited consequence and personal in its kind and purpose.

The life of Ibn Khaldun in Egypt was more settled, tranquil and luxurious than in North Africa. But it seems that clouds of sorrow and moral pain hung over this comfortable life. In Egypt he was a stranger far from home and family, and lived in an atmosphere of antagonism and dispute. We can perceive the pain of nostalgia in certain places. He expresses it when he tells us of his contact with the Sultan on his arrival and says: "The Sultan showed me the utmost kindness and made me feel at home." He reveals this pain in various places.

There is no doubt that the loss of the historian's family increased his moral pain. He speaks of this calamity in a tone of sorrow and dispair when he says: "Misfortune and despair were great and I was inclined to lead a hermit's life."

Ibn Khaldun preferred a life of seclusion in various intervals, to which he refers in certain parts. Thus he tells us that he passed his time at home enjoying health and preferring seclusion. His Egyptian biographers also refer to this seclusion; Al-Sakhawi says: "He was accompanied by many friends in his retired life; he was cheerful to them and often joked with them." In these intervals the historian was busy corresponding with his friends in North Africa and Andalusia—sultans, emirs and *faqihs*, as he says in more than one place.

It would be interesting to know where the historian lived in Cairo. We have two statements quoted by Ibn Hajar from Al-Jamal al-Bishbishi. Al-Jamal says in the first that he was one day not far from Al-Salihiah and there saw Ibn Khaldun on his way to his house, accompanied by some of his assistant judges. We understand from this statement that the historian lived for some time not far from Al-Salihiah, the district in which his school was situated, that is to say, the district of Bein al-Qasrein, or in another quarter close to it, because his office as chief justice was in this school and that the office of the Maliki *faqihs* was in the neighbourhood.* In his second statement Al-Jamal says, in reference to Ibn Khaldun's appointment as judge on his return from Damascus in 803 A.H.: "Ibn Khaldun preferred to live close to the Nile and was fond of hearing lady singers..." This statement indicates that the historian lived in one of the districts lying in the vicinity of Nile, perhaps the island of Al-Rawda, or on the opposite bank in Al-Fustat where there was a remnant of an aristocratic quarter which rose there since Al-Rawda was founded and populated and became the seat of the court in the middle of the seventh century when the great and the wealthy inhabited

* Al-Makrizi. *Al-Khitat*, Vol. II, pp. 371-72.

the opposite bank in Al-Fustat. This supposition is more probable, the Kamhiah school, where Ibn Khaldun always lectured, being situated near this district.

As for the last abode of the historian, Al-Sakhawi writes that he was buried in the Sufi cemetery outside Bab al-Nasr, and Al-Makrizi says that this cemetery was situated between a number of tombs and cemeteries built by the emirs and notables in the eighth century A.H. outside Bab al-Nasr in the direction of Al-Raidaniah (now Al-Abbassiah).* This cemetery was made by the Sufis of Al-Salahiah Institute (Khanqah) about the end of the eighth century, and dedicated to the burial of the Sufis. The historian, as we have seen, was for some time manager of the Beibers Sufi Institute.

Will time reveal to us one day where the mortal remains of the great thinker are buried, when his tomb would be a revered monument visited by the admirers of his splendid thought and immortal work?

* *Al-Khitat*, Vol II, p 463.

BOOK II

THE INTELLECTUAL AND SOCIAL LEGACY OF IBN KHALDUN

CHAPTER I

Society as exposed by Ibn Khaldun

Ibn Khaldun's comprehension of history. Sociology or the conditions of human community How he considers it the basis to understand history. His analysis of social phenomena. How he divides sociology. The contents of the Prolegomena. Ibn Khaldun's criticism of historians. His exposition of the subject of his science. His theory of the *Asabiyah* (Vitality). Ibn Khaldun and the Arabs His opinions of the state and sovereignty. His theory on the age of the state. The kinds of sovereignty. The origin of cities and countries. Livelihood and how to earn it. The different kinds of sciences.

IBN KHALDUN is distinguished from the rest of Moslem historians, indeed from all his predecessors, by the fact that he considered history as a science worthy of study—not as narrative merely recorded. He wished to write history in the light of a new method of explanation and reasoning, and his reflections and studies led him to establish a kind of social philosophy. He wrote the Prolegomena of his historical work as a preliminary explanation in the light of which history should be read and its events understood. It has thus become an independent work of striking originality, recording a new system in understanding and explaining

the social phenomena, and also in understanding, criticizing and analysing history.

Ibn Khaldun describes us this new study, which he discovered as an independent science, with a special subject—sociology and human community, and special problems, " which are to explain all the phenomena and conditions appertaining to it, one after the other ". He also tells us that this science " is new, with strange orientation and immense interest ", to which he was led by private research, not dealt with by any previous writer except, perhaps, the ancients whose works perished and are therefore unknown to us; he is thus the first to discover it, and lay down and explain its principles.

This new science, which Ibn Khaldun invented to understand and study history, has great importance. In his opinion it is a science to distinguish truth from falsehood in recording events, and to show the possible and the impossible, " by looking into human society which is sociology, and to distinguish the conditions which appertain to it and are different in its nature from those which are only occasional and others which cannot arise. By doing this we apply a science which distinguishes truth from falsehood in records and in a method supported by proofs which admits of no doubt ". It was the attempt to understand history, in this

manner, which urged Ibn Khaldun to study this new subject, which is "*Al-Umran*" or "*Al-Ijtima al-Bashari*" العمران او الاجتماع البشرى, that is to say sociology or conditions of human society.

But Ibn Khaldun looks at this subject from a different point of view, and makes of all human society and the phenomena, connected with it, a subject for his reflection, and tries to study and analyse the society, in all its phases, from its beginning and nomadic state till it is settled and organized in countries and states, as well as its fluctuations between weakness and strength, youth and old age, and rise and fall, and inquires, in the course of his study, about the state and the characteristics of the society, the elements it is composed of, its organization from the simple individual and group to monarch and state, and the circumstances and conditions encountered by these elements in their private and public life, the requirements of the safety of the society, and the symptoms of its decline and fall. In fact, Ibn Khaldun deals with a vast material which is beyond his preceding definition.

In another place Ibn Khaldun summarizes the elements of his science from the subjective point of view, *viz.*, the social conditions encountered by men assembled in society, in the sphere of monarchy,

livelihood, sciences and trades in a manner which reveals truth and leaves no room for fancy and doubt.*

He then divides his subject into six large chapters:

I. Human society in general, its kinds and its share in the world.

II. Nomadic society, the tribes and the savage nations.

III. States, the Caliphate, sovereignty and monarchical functions.

IV. Civilized society, countries and towns.

V. Trades, living and the ways to earn livelihood.

VI. Sciences and how to acquire them.†

This general division gives us an idea of what Ibn Khaldun considers as the subject of the science of human community. This division reveals a great deal of precision and ability, particularly when we review all the matters dealt with in his Prolegomena and see how the subject extends and opens so many ramifications, and how Ibn Khaldun arranges the links of his research in a connected, compact chain which proves the superiority of his genius, his originality and the force of his argument.

In this treatise we do not propose to analyse and

* *The Prolegomena*, p. 33.

† *Ibid*., p. 34.

criticize the philosophy and social theories of Ibn Khaldun. This is a task too vast for this treatise, but we shall try to expose, briefly, the contents of his Prolegomena, and to consider some of his social theories.

Ibn Khaldun opens his Prolegomena inquiring into the value of history and its kinds, and the errors into which the historians fall in recording news and events, whether dictated by purpose and partiality or inadvertently and from ignorance of the laws of sociology and the conditions of society, want of precision and investigation in estimating the possible and the impossible. He then gives several examples which he discusses and tries to point out the errors in them. This discussion, however, is some times weak and partial. As for weakness, it is evident, for instance, from the reasons he gives to contradict the story of Al-Abbassa, Al-Rashid's sister, with Ja'far al-Barmaki, and his defence of Al-Rashid's character and afterwards his defence of the character of Al-Mamun.* As far partiality, it is evident, for instance, from his statements about the lineage of the Obaydi (Fatimide) Caliphs, the lineage of the Idrisides in Morrocco, and his attempt to refute the attacks on their

* *The Prolegomena*, pp. 12, 14, 16 and 17.

lineage.* We have seen that Ibn Khaldun's life, as a statesman, serving various states and courts, makes him some times submit to influences of doctrine and passion. Most of his statements in this chapter are new and interesting, and much of his blame on the previous chroniclers and historians is strong and severe. He then goes on to point out the necessity of ascertaining facts and events in accordance with this law which is formed, in his opinion, by the study of sociology, or the science of human community, as we have seen. After the long critical preface Ibn Khaldun speaks to us of the science the subject of which he discovered. He begins, in accordance with the division he made, to speak of sociology in general, and explains the nature of society, the necessity for it and how it varies according to the climate, how it is affected by changes of weather in hot, cold and temperate zones, the effect of atmosphere on the character, colour and conditions of men and, in the meantime, speaks to us of the geography of the world as it was known in his age, that is to say, the geography of the seven zones. There is nothing original or new in this chapter. In the second chapter Ibn Khaldun deals with different kinds of nomadic society, and speaks at great length of Bedouin society and its

* *The Prolegomena*, pp. 17-20.

characteristics and compares it with urban society. Here we find one of the new social theories discovered by the historian. He speaks of what he calls *Al-Asabiyah* العصبية (vitality of state or dynasty), that is to say, the power and influence of the tribe or family, based, as he considers, on family and similar ties. This *Asabiyah* is the origin of power and authority, or the state in nomadic society. This power belongs to those who enjoy the *Asabiyah*, and the nobility of lineage which is the origin of *Asabiyah* and then power extends, in his opinion, to four generations. It may extend to five or six, but in a state of decline and weakness. *Asabiyah*, and consequently power, comes to an end with the dissolution of noble lineage and goes to another tribe or family which enjoys the privilege of number and force, and so on. The object of *Asabiyah* is sovereignty.* Here Ibn Khaldun speaks of the characteristics of sovereignty, the difference of its kind and extent in accordance with the nations where it rises, the effect of conquest on the conquered nations, who are generally fond of imitating the conqueror.

Ibn Khaldun then speaks of the Arabs. His statements of the Arabs are interesting notwith-

* See the explanation of Ibn Khaldun of his theory on *Asabiyah* and its characteristics and evolution in the Prolegomena, pp. 108-17.

standing their severity and partiality. In his opinion the Arabs are a savage nation whose conquests are made for pillage and devastation, and they succeed only in easy plains and do not dare to cross mountains or plateaus owing to their difficult nature, and whenever they conquer a country it will soon become desolate because their nomadic nature, their disobedience and want of discipline are contrary to organized society; also because they are fond of destruction and pillage. They demolish buildings and rob all sorts of property and injure business and trade and are the least of nations adapted to the requirements of sovereignty, because in their nomadic nature and rough character they are more fond of independence and liberty and submit to no authority or discipline, while the establishment of sovereignty requires discipline, submission and obedience.* Ibn Khaldun goes on to attack the Arabs in other parts of his Prolegomena. He tells us that the buildings raised by the Arabs soon fall into ruins, and that the Arabs are the least disposed to engage in trade, that they are not fit for learning, and that most of the scholars in the Moslem states were non-Arabs.† Although Ibn Khaldun in this campaign presents many proofs

* *The Prolegomena*, pp. 125-28

† *Ibid.*, pp. 300, 337 and 477.

and right observations, yet his judgment on the Arabs is exaggerated and many of his opinions lack arguments. There is no much room here to discuss and refute his opinions, yet we must say with regard to the Arab conquests that it was the Arabs who invaded the valleys of Syria, the plateaus of Anatolia and Armenia and penetrated beyond Persia; they also invaded North Africa as far as Morocco and Spain, and crossed the Pyrenees into France. All these countries are rugged with no plains easy to invade; they were all conquered by the Arabs in less than one century and in a torrent of brilliant victories. Also the Arabs did not devastate these countries; on the contrary they established flourishing states and societies. To refute the theory of Ibn Khaldun with regard to the characteristics of the Arab conquests, it would be enough to cite the rise of the Omayyad Caliphate in the East and of the Moslem state in Spain. We may understand the reason of this severe condemnation of the Arabs by Ibn Khaldun when we remember that, although claiming to be of the Arab origin, he belongs, in fact, to that Berber race whose country the Arabs conquered and imposed on it their religion and language, and forced it, after a long struggle and revolution, to be absorbed by the Moslem block and to submit reluctantly to

the rule of the Arabs in Africa and Spain until the opportunity came for its rise and liberation. The antagonism between the Arabs and the Berbers in Africa and Spain is well known in the history of Islam, the Berbers having inherited their hatred of the Arabs long before. Ibn Khaldun was born and bred in this Berber society, burning with its feelings, traditions and memories. His family lived in it a hundred years before and enjoyed the patronage and favours of the Berber Almohades. It is not strange, therefore, to see Ibn Khaldun condemning the Arabs in this most severe and cruel manner.

On the other hand we must point out that Ibn Khaldun is inspired here with two motives, scientific and the national. He severely attacks the Arabs to whom he claims to belong and tries to support his views with historical proofs and examples; his arguments here reveal a scientific disposition free from the chains of inherited traditions. He seems to be inspired by a strong national feeling; he speaks with the tongue of his Berber fatherland which the Arabs invaded and devastated for generations and imposed on it their religious and political authority and, for ages, fought for its liberty and independence.

In the third chapter Ibn Khaldun speaks of the

state and sovereignty. The state comes into existence through tribal force and *Asabiyah*, as already said, and it has peculiar characteristics and forms which vary according to those who control it. Religious doctrine has its effects on strengthening the state, but such doctrine cannot also be upheld without *Asabiyah*. Dissension weakens the state and hastens its downfall. Sovereignty, like the state, has qualities, characteristics of which are: monopolizing glory, luxury, comfort and tranquillity—characteristics which, when rooted, bring the state to old age and then to downfall. The state, like men, also has natural age, and Ibn Khaldun estimates the age of the state from its rise to youth, old age and downfall, generally in three generations, a generation being estimated at forty years. Thus the age of the state does not generally exceed one hundred and twenty years, except in rare cases.* This theory agrees with his theory on lineage of which we spoke in dealing with the *Asabiyah*. Here Ibn Khaldun reaches the summit of invention and originality, and his social theories and analyses of society appear at the zenith of their force and brilliance. In our opinion this chapter is the best of all in the Prolegomena, the strongest in exposition and argument, and the most convincing

* *The Prolegomena*, pp. 142-43.

in proving the abilities of this sound, distinguished brain.

Ibn Khaldun discusses the subject of the state and sovereignty at great length. He then deals with the conversion of the state from nomadic to civilized condition, its various phases and the effect of the *Mawali* (slaves) and the proteges on this evolution. He then goes on to speak of sovereignty and its kinds, the *Imama* and the Caliphate and the various opinions on them, the sheite doctrines and the conversion of the Caliphate to sovereignty, the formalities of the Caliphate, such as those of accession and choice of a crown prince, etc., its titles, religious posts, which are the courts, justice and the mint; then of monarchy and its institutions, as the cabinet posts, government offices, the collection of taxes, correspondence, the police, the command of the fleets, monarchical traditions and manifestations, wars and their methods, dues and the trade systems. He concludes this chapter by speaking of injustice which leads to the dissolution of the state and the destruction of civilization. His statements on this subject are strong and original.

Next to the subject of the state comes the subject of the countries and cities, the origin of towns, their characteristics and varied conditions, such as fertility and prosperity, or aridity and poverty,

difference of the effect of which extends far beyond the countries to which these cities belong. Then the disposition of the bedouins as regards the towns, and the dependence of the extent of civilization in the countries, on the conditions of the state, civilization being the extreme object of society and the end of its life, that it leads to corruption, the difference between countries in crops, industries and lauguages. This is the subject of the fourth chapter of the Prolegomena.

In the fifth chapter Ibn Khaldun speaks of livelihood and the means to earn it, and to amass wealth. He then speaks of commerce, supply and demand, monopoly, prices, etc., and of trades, their kinds and conditions in a general way, and reserves a special chapter to each of the principal trades, such as agriculture, building, weaving, midwifery, and medicine.

He dedicates the sixth chapter to sciences and education. Learning is one of the characteristics of civilization ; it grows and flourishes where civilization is great. He then speaks of the different kinds of religious and social sciences (divine and human) with delightful long chapters on visions, magic, the secrets of letters (cipher), alchemy, spiritism, the occult sciences and clairvoyance, all of which, in his opinion, are kinds of sciences or

appertaining to them. He then condemns philosophy and philosophers which he considers a useless science and a danger to religion and creed, and discusses and refutes some of the philosophical principles. He then goes on to speak of education and its systems and the characteristics of the scholars, and states that in Islam most of them were non-Arabs. He concludes with a chapter on philology, rhetoric, prose and poetry and the methods of poetry in his age.

CHAPTER II

The Science of Politics and Monarchical Institutions before Ibn Khaldun

Ibn Khaldun discoverer of sociology Politics and monarchical institutions before him. *Kitab al-Sultan* by Ibn Kutayba. The social theories of Al-Farabi The stataments of *Ikhwan al-Safa* on politics and their divisions. What Ibn Khaldun learned from all this. Development of the science of politics. *Al-Ahkam al-Sultaniah wa Siyasat al-Mulk* by Abul Hassan al-Mawardi. *Siraj al-Muluk* by Abu Bakr al-Turtushi. Ibn Khaldun's statements on Turtushi's book. Al-Ghazali's treatise on monarchical politics. *Al-Manhaj al-Masluk*. *Al-Adab al-Sultaniah* by Ibn al-Tiqtaqa. Its subject and critical spirit. Ibn Khaldun's originality.

THESE are the contents of this famous Prolegomena in which Ibn Khaldun explains his new science *Al-Umran* (Sociology) and which paves the way for reading and understanding history. This Prolegomena is the first book of his general history, but, as we have seen, it is voluminous, independent unit distinguished by the excellence of its invention, vast scope, new subjects and deep studies. If this new study, which Ibn Khaldun treats with great detail, skill and precision, commands our admiration and astonishment, it urges us to inquire, at the same time, the real share of

Ibn Khaldun of this splendid invention. Has he the merits of discovering this science, or has he only the merit of developing a study dealt with before? Ibn Khaldun tells us that his science is entirely new and it was inspired to him.* Perhaps he hardly knows what this science exactly is. How much truth is there in this statement? We tried to discover the sources consulted by Ibn Khaldun among the works of the previous Moslem thinkers, which touch his subject or approach it, and to ascertain, by the study of these works, what the historian-philosopher learned from his predecessors. After long research we were convinced that Ibn Khaldun is the master of his subject, the inventor of his science and has the credit of being the first to discover this new science which he calls sociology or the science of human society. It is true there are subjects dealt with by Ibn Khaldun which were dealt with before, and studies which touch some of the subjects of his science. But, as we shall see, they are all restricted studies of certain small points of that vast science which Ibn Khaldun deals with in such detail, in a closely connected series, rich in arguments. All that his predecessors left on the subject are mere short references scattered here and there, not combined in a general unit and cannot, alone, be considered

* *The Prolegomena*, p. 33.

the foundation of this distinguished social study. We propose to deal with these previous studies, to some of which Ibn Khaldun refers, to see by material comparison to what height this superior brain rises in the horizon of originality and invention.

We have not found, before Ibn Khaldun, a Moslem thinker who makes of society, its formation and characteristics, a subject of study and reflection. But we find some Moslem thinkers who treated, since the third century A.H., the subject of politics and monarchy as a special science or literature. In that age politics were understood in a very limited sense—explanation of the qualities which should be possessed by the Sultan (Monarch), the faults from which he should be free in order to be a capable ruler. As for monarchy, it is treated from the point of view of the conditions which should be legally found in the *Imam* or the Sultan, and those qualities which render him unfit to rule, then the monarchical functions, such as posts of ministers, emirate, and the various departments (*diwans*). The oldest we found on the subject are the statements of Ibn Kutayba al-Dinawari* in his book *Uyun al-Akhbar* in which he reserves a special chapter entitled "Kitab al-Sultan" (the Book of the Sultan) to speak of the qualities which the

* Died in 276 A.H. (889 A.D.).

Sultan should have, on the formalities of his company, treatment and consultation, and on his duties towards officials and governors.* In his statements Ibn Kutayba relies on a collection of sayings and maxims, many of which being attributed to Persian and Indian sages. His statements take the form more of counsels than a critical exposition. In the early part of the fourth century A.H. we find a Moslem philosopher, Abu Nasr al-Farabi †, who refers, in his studies, to the subject of society in a philosophical manner. He speaks in his book *Mabadi Ara ahl al-Madina al-Fadila* (the principles of the community of the ideal town) of the need of man of society and co-operation, on the origin of villages and towns, on the qualities of the head of the ideal town (Sultan), that which is not compatible with it, the difference between the community of the ideal towns and the corrupted towns, then on trades and their different kinds ‡—all this he deals with in a philosophical and very concise manner.

In the middle of the fourth century appeared the philosophical tracts entitled *Rasayil Ikhwan al-Safa*, (Tracts of the Brothers of Sincerity), with brief

* See this chapter in *Uyun al-Akhbar* (Cairo Library edition), Vol I, pp 1-107

† Died in 339 A H (950 A D) He is known to the Europeans as Alfarabius

‡ *Kitab al-Madina al-Fadila* (Leyden), pp 53, 59 and 67.

references and passages on some political and social subjects. *Ikhwan al-Safa* consider politics an independent science and divide it into five sections: the prophetical, monarchical, public, private and personal politics. The first concerns with laying down the sublime principles and laws, and purifying souls from wicked creeds and opinions. As for the monarchical politics, they are: "The task of preserving the *sharia* (laws) of the nation, reviving the *sunna* (prophetical traditions) among the community by urging to do good and forbidding evil; this object can be realized by repressing crimes, enforcing the laws laid down by the founder of the *sharia* (the Prophet), quelling injustice, repressing enemies and criminals, and supporting good men." With regard to the public politics which is the exercising authority over communities, such as that of princes on countries and towns, or that of army commanders on the troops, it is defined as "knowing the classes of subordinates, their conditions, lineage, trades, creeds, character, noting their classes and managing their affairs, etc." With regard to the private politics it is every man's knowledge respecting management of his house and living. As for personal politics it is that every man should know himself and his character.*

* *Rasayil Ikhwan al-Safa* (Cairo), Vol. II, pp. 208-09.

Ikhwan al-Safa further speak of the object of monarchy and the kinds of sovereignty, of the post of *Imam*, its conditions and laws.* They speak of sciences, which they divide into three large parts: mathematics, man-made jurisprudence and realistic philosophy, each division having many subdivisions and branches. Literature of all kinds comes under the first division, the sciences of religion, Quran and *sunna* come under the second, and logic, physics and theology come under the third. As for politics they come under theology.† *Ikhwan al-Safa* also speak of the division of trades and the elements they need. They speak in a special chapter of the effect of the nature of countries on character.‡ All this is dealt with in a scientific and philosophical style, excellent in expression and argument.

We must pause here a little. We find that some of the subjects dealt with by Ibn Khaldun in his Prolegomena are also dealt with by Al-Farabi and *Ikhwan al-Safa*. For instance, Al-Farabi's statements about the need of man of society, and the origin of villages and towns, and the statements of *Ikhwan al-Safa* about the divisions of sciences and trades,

* *Rasayil Ikhwan al-Safa*, Vol. I, p. 23, Vol. IV, pp. 30, 181 and the following.

† *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 202 and the following

‡ *Ibid.*, pp. 232-35.

and the effect of the nature of countries on character. As we have seen Ibn Khaldun dealt with all these questions* and made them the subject of his science. But by comparison we find that Ibn Khaldun agrees on these subjects with Al-Farabi and *Ikhwan al-Safa* only in the head-lines, and while Al-Farabi and *Ikhwan al-Safa* deal with them in a purely philosophic and scientific manner, Ibn Khaldun deals with them from the social point of view, and exposes them in a purely practical manner, and follows a new method in argument. Here also he is not lacking independence and originality.

We then find that study which has been commonly called politics take its place and become a special literature, dealt with at one time from a purely legal point of view, and at another from an ethical-philosophical one. One of the best known books which deal with its legal side is *Kitab al-Ahkam al-Sultaniah* (the Book of the Sultanic Laws) by Abul Hassan al-Mawardi, who died in 450 A.H. (1058 A.D.). It is one of the most noted and valuable works on the subject. In this book the author deals at great length with the post of *Imam* and its con-

* See the Prolegomena on the necessity of human society, p. 34; the rise of towns and cities, p. 286 and the following; the division of sciences, p. 358 and the following; the division of trade, p. 318 and the following; and the effect of climate on human character, pp. 72-73.

ditions, the qualities he should possess and those which disqualify him for the post, and the duties of the nation towards him. He then deals with the Vizierate (ministry) and its kinds, Emirate and its kinds, and the exercise of justice and its conditions, booty, the spoils, the tribute, the *Kharaj* (land tax) and their provisions, feudalism, *diwans* (government departments) and the penal laws—all this is dealt with from a legal point of view according to the *Shafei* doctrine. Al-Mawardi has also another treatise on the Vizierate and the monarchical policy, in which he speaks at great length of the post of minister and his qualifications. He then speaks of the minister, his competence, duties and rights towards the Sultan, the duties of the Sultan towards him and the different kinds of ministries and the relations of the minister with the Sultan. This study of Al-Mawardi is ethical-philosophical embodying many maxims and traditional sayings.

In *Siraj al-Muluk* of the Andalusian, Abu Bakr al-Turtushi, who died in 520 A.H. (1126 A.D.), the study advances a little. He exposes his subject from the ethical-philosophical point of view. He deals with certain subjects not treated by his predecessors, and speaks of the qualities the Sultan should have and those which lead to the downfall

of monarchy. He then speaks of the qualities of the Sultan separately, and his vices also separately, then of the duties of the Sultan to his soldiers and subjects, his duties towards the public funds and how to spend them, of the tribute and the conditions required by the governors, of *diwans*, of injustice and its evil effects, of wars, their laws and management. Al-Turtushi's work is the largest of its kind, but the religious colour prevails in its style and it takes, generally, the form of preaching, embodying many *hadith*, maxims and famous sayings. Al-Turtushi tells us in his preface " that no previous writers dealt with these subjects ". But we find that more than one oriental writer preceded Al-Turtushi on these subjects, although he is distinguished by his detailed exposition, and by dealing with some subjects not dealt with before.

Ibn Khaldun particularly speaks of Al-Turtushi's book among the books dealing with his subject. He tells us that in the book of politics, attributed to Aristotle, there is an interesting part on the subject of his science, but it is incomplete and does not give sufficient argument. Likewise, in Ibn al-Mukaffa's work and the political passages which he gives in the course of his tracts, many of the points touching his science, but not proved in the manner he adopts; Ibn al-Mukaffa treating them

as a sort of rhetorical essays. But Ibn Khaldun tells us plainly that Al-Turtushi in his book *Siraj al-Muluk*, touched subjects approaching his own, and divided them into chapters almost similar to those of his book, but he did not realize the desired object and did not rightly treat the subject, or thoroughly deal with its points, nor did he give satisfactory arguments; he merely puts the problem and cites many traditional sayings, indeed, he turned round the subject, but did not seize it nor did he succeed in his enterprise.* The fact is that Ibn Khaldun dealt with some of the subjects treated by Al-Turtushi, such as the *diwans* (government offices), the methods of war, and the consequences of injustice, but in exposition and arguments he adopts another method, and in Al-Turtushi's book we see no trace of this new social doctrine which dominates the study of Ibn Khaldun from the beginning to the end

We have two other treatises on this subject—we mean the monarchical politics. The first is *Al-Tibr al-Masbuk fi Nasayih al-Muluk*, attributed to Abu Hamid al-Ghazali who died in 505 A.H. (1112 A.D.). This book was written in the Persian language for Sultan Muhammad ibn Malik Shah, and is a collection of counsels on the qualities with which

* *The Prolegomena*, p. 33.

the Sultan should be adorned, embodying many sermons and old stories.* The second is entitled *Al-Manhaj al Masluk fi Siyasat al-Muluk* written by Abd al-Rahman ibn Abdulla for Sultan Salah al-Din (about the end of the sixth century A.H.) on the same subject, that is to say the qualities of the Sultan, containing a legal exposition about war, spoil, and some old sermons and stories.

We further have a book distinguished by comprehensiveness of the subject and originality in its exposition. This is *Al-Fakhri fil Adab al-Sultaniah wal dual al-Islamiah* by Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Tabatiba, known by the name of Al-Tiqtaqa, who lived, as we deduce from his book, about the end of the seventh century and the beginning of the eighth A.H., after the fall of the Abbaside Caliphate. He wrote this book about the end of 701 A.H. (1302 A.D.) in the city of Mosul for its Emir, Issa ibn Ibrahim.† In his book Ibn al-Tiqtaqa reserves a large chapter to sultanic matters and monarchical politics‡ but he exposes his subject in another form. He tells us in his prefacc that he does not propose to speak of the origin of monarchy, its

* This treatise appeared in the margin of *Siraj al-Muluk* (Cairo edition).

† See the author's preface in *Greifswald,* published by the orientalist Ahlwardt in 1858, and the publisher's preface in German, pp. 14-15.

‡ *Al-Fakhri,* pp. 19-88.

essence and its division into religious and temporal authorities, as Caliphate, Sultanate, Emirate and governorship, what was in this compatible with the *Sharia* (law) and what was not, the doctrines of thinkers on the *Imama*; he merely intends to study the question of politics and rules which could be adopted in the current events, and in managing the affairs of people, organizing the defence of the country, and in reforming morals and mode of life.* In this chapter Ibn al-Tiqtaqa speaks of the qualities the ideal king should have and those he should not have, then of the rights of the king towards the subjects, principally obedience, and deals at great length with the advantages and manners of obedience in the Omayyad and Abbaside Caliphates and how its loss was one of the strongest factors in the decay and downfall of the Abbaside Caliphate, and supports his theory with historical events and facts.† He then speaks of the rights of the subjects towards the king and the kinds of politics he ought to follow towards the various classes, as well as penalties, their proportion and circumstances, the danger of being plunged in pleasure to both the King and the state. In the course of his statements he quotes some of the

* *Al-Fakhri*, p 19.
† *Ibid*, pp. 35-36.

counsels of the Greek and Persian sages. But he is less interested in exposing theoretical principles than in their application to the events of history, particularly that of the Moslem dynasties. He is distinguished in exposing and applying them by a strong critical tendency rarely found in the works of his predecessors. He is also distinguished by his excellent arguments and the application of theories to facts. We can even say that the preliminary chapter to the history of Moslem dynasties was a new achievement of historical criticism and in the study of the state from the social point of view; and there is no doubt that it comes under the subjects of that vast social study from which Ibn Khaldun evolved his science and social doctrine. It seems, however, that Ibn Khaldun had no knowledge of this work which deals with certain parts of his subject. The book was modern in his age and, its circulation limited to the East, had not reached North Africa. Moreover, the subject dealt with by Ibn al-Tiqtaqa is too restricted as regards the studies of Ibn Khaldun, and if both of them understood history in an analytical manner, Ibn Khaldun greatly surpasses his predecessor by the vastness of his scope, and adopts in his study another course which maintains all its originality and force.

Now that we have reviewed all that the Moslem

thinkers have written on the subject of the state, and the monarchical, civil and social politics before the age of Ibn Khaldun, and proved by material comparison that all this legacy neither supplied nor inspired Ibn Khaldun with the subject of his science, although it refers here and there to certain points dealt with by Ibn Khaldun, yet we can affirm with Ibn Khaldun that the science he calls *Al-Umran*, *i.e.*, sociology or the science of human community, is a science which did not exist before him in Moslem thought; indeed it did not extist in the ancient thought, with the exception of some of the writings of Greek philosophers about the institutions of state and society, particularly Aristotle. If, therefore, Ibn Khaldun had profited by a part of the legacy of the past, it would be from this ancient legacy. It seems that Ibn Khaldun was acquainted with certain sides of the philosophy of Aristotle, as is evident from his reference to the "politics" of Aristotle, and the commentary of Ibn Rushd (Averroes) on Aristotle.* There is no doubt, however, that this benefit was of little importance whether as regards forming his historical or his social philosophy.

As we have already said Ibn Khaldun was

* *The Prolegomena*, p. 33. Ibn Khaldun made short studies on the works of Ibn Rushd, but they have not come down to us.

therefore the master of his subject and the discoverer of his science. He rightly tells us that his science was new, and that it is not the same as the science of civil politics dealt with previously by his predecessors; in fact a totally invented science, independent and not dealt with before by any previous thinker, or not dealt with such originality, extension and profoundness.

We shall see that this science, discovered by Ibn Khaldun, assumes, from the point of view of its materials and subjects, its place among our modern sciences, in sociology, the philosophy of his history, organization and political economy.

We shall point out in another chapter how modern criticism highly appreciates the legacy of Ibn Khaldun, and considers him the inventor and the founder of modern sociology.

CHAPTER III

Kitab al-Ibar and Al-Taarif

Ibn Khaldun's historical work Revision of his History and additions to its contents His praise of the qualities of the Berbers His method and style *Kitab al-Taarif*, or the autobiography of Ibn Khaldun The contents of *Al-Taarif* Ibn Khaldun's frankness in revealing many of his characteristics His strong qualities The romantic side of his autobiography Has Ibn Khaldun written other works?

I

THIS first book in which Ibn Khaldun exposes his theories on history and sociology, and which alone fills a large volume, is only an introduction to his large history or his general history

Ibn Khaldun calls his historical work: *Kitab al-Ibar, wa Diwan al-Mubtada wal Khabar, fi Ayyam al-Arabi wal Ajami wal Barbar, wa man Asarahum min zawi al-Sultan al-Akbar*

كتاب العبر و ديوان المبتدا والخبر - في ايام العرب
والعجم والبربر - ومن عاصرهم من ذوي السلطان الاكبر

He divides it into the following three large books:

I. Society and its inherent phenomena, such as sovereignty, authority, earning one's livelihood, trades, sciences and causes and reasons appertaining to them. This is the book we spoke of before, known by the name of "Prolegomena."

II. History of the Arabs, their generations and dynasties from the creation to the present time, containing the annals of some of the contemporary nations and great men and their dynasties, such as the Pontians, the Syrians, the Persians, the Jews, the Copts, the Greeks, the Romans, the Turks and the Franks.

III. The history of the Berbers and tribes appertaining to them, such as the Zanata, their origin and generations, and their kingdom and dynasties in North Africa.

Ibn Khaldun's work fills seven large volumes, the first comprising the first book which deals with "Al-Umran" or Sociology, being the Prolegomena. The historical work begins with the second volume, and the second book which deals with the history of the Arabs and their generations, and the histories of the ancient nations, the Turks and the Franks up to the eighth century A.H. (14th A.D.) fills four volumes, from the second to the fifth. The third book, which deals with the history of the Berbers up to the days of the author, fills the sixth and

seventh volumes. Ibn Khaldun closes his work by speaking of himself in several long chapters, as we shall explain.

Like most of the Moslem historians Ibn Khaldun begins from the origin of the creation and the racial lineage of the various nations. Most part of his statement is mere repetition of old religious legends given in the Moslem chronicles quoted from the Bible and Hersius, but he expresses his doubt with regard to many of them. He then gives us a full programme of his history.* He begins with the pre-Islamic Arabs, the Jews, the Greeks, the Romans and the Persians; most of his narrative on the Greeks and the Romans is copied from Ibn al-Amid (Al-Makin).

His narrative of the advent of Islam, the life of the Prophet and the age of the first four Caliphs (Al-Rashidin) is given in a special supplement to the second volume. From the third volume he begins the history of Moslem states and speaks of the Omayyad Caliphate, then of the Abbaside Calipate at great length; the history of the two Caliphates filling the third volume. The fourth volume contains the history of the Fatamides, the Carmathians and the history of the Moors in Spain from its conquest to the beginning of the Banu

* *Kitab al-Ibar*, Vol. II, pp. 16-17.

al-Ahmar dynasty, and the histories of Banu Boweh (Bueds) and Banu Subaktukin. The fifth volume gives at great length the history of the Seljuke Turks and the history of the Crusades, as well as the history of the Mameluke dynasties in Egypt up to the end of the eighth century A.H. Ibn Khaldun relies in this section—that is to say the history of the Arabs and the Moslem dynasties—on the legacy of his predecessors such as Ibn Hisham, Al-Waqidi, Al-Baladhuri, Ibn Abd al-Hakam, Al-Tabari, Al-Masudi, Ibn al-Athir and others. The third book, or the sixth volume, contains the history of the Berbers. Ibn Khaldun says that the history of the Berbers was his principal object in writing his historical work. In the Prolegomena he says: "I give in this book all I could learn of this Berber country, either directly or indirectly, as my object is to write only the history of North Africa, the conditions of its generations and nations, as well as its kingdoms, for I am not aware of the conditions of the East and its nations, and the current histories are not sufficient in realizing my object in a proper way."* This statement by Ibn Khaldun has a special value. Some critics attacked his history and accused him of incapacity and want of sufficient knowledge and precision in what he wrote

* *The Prolegomena*, p. 27.

about the East; we have already quoted Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar and others on the subject. The fact is that the chapter relating to the Berbers in his *Kitab al-Ibar* is, next to the Prolegomena, the most excellent and original, the strongest in exposition and precision, giving strange narratives and facts on the conditions of those Berber nations and tribes which escaped all historians before or after Ibn Khaldun. This is not strange considering that Ibn Khaldun is, by the nature of his origin and life, his services to the various Berber states and courts, and his profound study of their conditions, the most fit master of the subject.

In this third book Ibn Khaldun speaks of the Arabs by adoption (Al-Mustariba) who are the remnant of the Arab Moslem dynasties in Mauritania, of the history of the Berbers, and the noted Berber tribes and branches, such as the Zanata, Maghrawa, Lawata, Masmuda, Al-Baranis, Kitama and Sanhaja from the earliest times to his age. He gives us the origin of the Berbers, their conditions and creed before the Moslem conquest, many reports and facts being unknown before. He relates concisely the history of the Almoravides and Almohades; and then relates at great length the history of the Berber dynasties close to his age or contemporaneous to him. As Ibn Khaldun was in

contact with most of these contemporary dynasties in whose vicissitudes he played great roles, he refers in many places to his personal attitudes and his dealings with them.* The history of the Berbers fills the sixth volume and most of the seventh of the *Kitab al-Ibar*, as known to us. But it is evident from the annals of the contemporary dynasties that Ibn Khaldun revised what he wrote on this subject and afterwards made many additions. We know that he completed writing the first copy of his history in Tunis in 783 A.H. before he emigrated to Egypt, and in the course of his statement about the history of Banu Hafs he says: " I proceeded with my narrative to the restoration of Tawzir from the hands of Ibn Yamlul while I was in Tunis. I then sailed in the middle of 784 A.H. to the East to accomplish the pilgrimage, and disembarked at Alexandria whence I went to Cairo, and the news of North Africa reached us through those who arrived from there."† Tawzir was restored in 783 A.H.‡ While in Cairo Ibn Khaldun revised and added to his history. He reached in his history of the Berber dynasties up to 790, 791 and 793 and some times to 796 A.H.** He

* See examples of this in Vol. VI, p. 377, 379 and Vol. VII, pp. 133, 143, 305, 329, 334 and 377.

† *Kitab al-Ibar*, Vol. VI, p. 396.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 395.

** *Ibid.*, Vol. VI, pp. 399, 403 and 429 ; Vol. VII, pp. 145-47, 218 19.

dealt with the annals of the Egyptian and the Turkish dynasties up to 793, 795, 796 and 797 A.H.* As for the annals of Andalusia he dealt with them up to 794 A.H.† All these are additions and new chapters annexed to the original work during his sojourn in Egypt, and the copy which reached us and is now current is, undoubtedly, one of the most complete.

In this part dealing with the history of the Berbers Ibn Khaldun reserves a special chapter to speak of their qualities and "of their humane virtues and noble characteristics in the past and in the present time". He says in an enthusiastic tone: "As for their humane virtues, their vieing with one another in noble qualities, their generous disposition which raises a nation to the rank of honour, and evokes praise from people; their appreciation of neighbourhood, protection of guests, keeping their promises and obligations, patience in adversity, refusal to submit to humiliation or tyranny, facing misfortunes, conquering authority and sacrificing their lives in the cause of religion, these are traditional qualities which, if recorded, would furnish good examples to those nations which follow them."‡ Ibn

* *Kitab al-Ibar*, Vol V, pp 540-50, 561-63.
† *Ibid*, Vol IV, p. 179
‡ *Ibid*, Vol VI, p. 103 and the following.

Khaldun has not written such a chapter on the qualities of any other nation; he thus reveals here a special sentiment and an evident Berber partiality. This also explains his severity in attacking the Arabs who had invaded Africa and subdued it.

There are, however, other parts of Ibn Khaldun's work besides the history of the Berbers which have a special value, such as the Moslem states in Sicily, the history of the Tawaif in Andalusia, the Christian states in Spain and the history of the Banu al-Ahmar dynasty in Granada. Dozy, the noted scholar, speaks of the value of the version of Ibn Khaldun on the history of the Christians in Spain, and says: "There is nothing in the Christian literature in the middle ages worthy of being compared with it, and that no Christian historian wrote a version with such clearness and precision on any Moslem state."* In these parts Ibn Khaldun greatly excels all other Moslem historians in precision and verification of reports; this is probably due to the fact that he consulted some contemporary sources which have not come down to us. Modern research has taken great interest in Ibn Khaldun's narrative about the history of the Berbers, as well as in most of the other parts of

* Dozy: *Recherches sur l'Histoire et la Litterature d'Espagne au moyen age*, p. 96.

his history, all of which have been translated into European languages as shall be seen.

Ibn Khaldun concludes his book with several chapters acquainting us with himself and his life from birth up to his emigration to Egypt, and the events with which he was connected there till the beginning of 797 A.H. These chapters are called *Al-Taarif*.

In the arrangement of his book Ibn Khaldun adopted a new method. He divided it into books, then into chapters connected with one another, and gave the history of each state separately, from the beginning to the end, taking into consideration the points of connection between the different states. In this respect he greatly surpasses his predecessors. Most of the earlier great historical works by Moslems were written in the form of historical tables arranged according to years, and the events of every year given together although disconnected and varied. But, instead of adopting this method, Ibn Khaldun resorted to the system of connected chapters and dynasties, which is more precise, better exposed and more harmonious. He was not, however, the first Moslem historian to adopt this system: it was adopted since the third and fourth centuries by historians like Al-Waqidi, Al-Baladhuri, Ibn Abd al-Hakam al-Misri and Al-Masudi, who recorded

history in connected chapters.* But he is distinguished from his predecessors by excellent arrangement and presentation, as well as by clearness, precision in the division of subjects and in making tables of contents.

Ibn Khaldun has a special style in exposition and expression. As his Prolegomena is distinguished by its new subjects, it is also distinguished by the brilliance of its literary style which is at the same time characterized by simplicity, force of expression, precision of argument and harmony. If the Prolegomena is an excellent model of mature thinking and surpassing originality, in our opinion it is also a high model of clearness, rhetoric and attractive exposition, notwithstanding occasional weakness of style, queerness of expression as well as the use of unusual words due to his Berber origin, and the influence of the literature of North Africa and Andalusia.

Ibn Khaldun writes his history in the same strong, simple style, and rises in certain places to the summit of vigorous expression. But in many places he is too concise so that his statements are both obscure and ambiguous or somewhat weak and full

* See Al-Waqidi in his book *Futuh Misr wal Sham*, attributed to him, Al-Baladhuri in his book *Futuh al-Buldan*; Ibn Abd al-Hakam in his book *Futuh Misr wa Akhbariha*; and Al-Masudi in his book *Muruj al-Zahab*.

of strange words. Yet he is always the master of his subject, distinguished by strong, excellent exposition.

II

Ibn Khaldun has left us his life written by his own hand. He is not the first Moslem writer and thinker to write an autobiography; many of them, particularly the recorders of *hadith*, wrote their autobiographies. Some of these scholars and historians who wrote their autobiographies are: Yacout al-Hamawi *(Mujam al-Udabba)*, Lisan al-Din ibn al-Khatib, the contemporary and friend of Ibn Khaldun *(Al-Ihata fi Akhbar Gharnata)*, his contemporary Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar *(Raf al-Isr un Kudat Misr)*, and Al-Suyuti *(Husn al-Muhadara)*. But all of them have given us short biographies. Ibn Khaldun was the first Moslem thinker who consecrated for himself a long biography which filled a whole book, and who tells us frankly of many of his acts and affairs which he should not have revealed. Ibn Khaldun rightly considers himself one of the personalities of history whose life is worthy of recording. For about one-third of a century he was an outstanding personality in contemporary North

African states, whose acts and influence affected their evolution and fate. His life is in fact a part of the history of these states which should not be overlooked.

Ibn Khaldun wrote his autobiography in several long chapters and made it an annexment to his historical work. These chapters are known by the name of *Al-Taarif* which is the title he gave to the first chapter—التعريف بابن خلدون مؤلف هذا الكتاب "Acquainting the reader with Ibn Khaldun, author of this book." It fills about one hundred large pages of the seventh volume of his history.* In *Al-Taarif* he tells us of his lineage, the history of his family since its arrival in Andalusia and settlement in Seville till it emigrated to North Africa, the part its chiefs played in the events of Andalusia, the high posts they occupied and the influence they exercised till the days of Al-Tawaif. He then tells us of his youth, his early education, the books he read and the sciences he studied, and his *shaikhs* (professors), biographies of many of whom he gives. He then speaks of his public life since he occupied the post of secretary to Abu Ishaq, Sultan of Tunis, in 752 A.H., and tells us a great deal about his relations with the emirs and states of North Africa, his various posts in the courts of Tunis, Bougie,

* *Kitab al-Ibar*, Vol VII, pp. 379-462.

Tlemcen and Fez, and of the influence he exercised there, while he was still in the prime of his life, under thirty years of age. He also tells us about his arrest and banishment more than once; then of his emigration to Andalusia and his relations with the King of Granada and his vizier Ibn al-Khatib, his mission to the King of Castille, his visit to Seville the first home of his family, and his disagreement with Ibn al-Khatib and the King of Granada when he returned to North Africa and entered the service of its emirs and states till he was again obliged to return and settle in Tunis. For some time he lived in retirement and began to write his book till it was completed. He finally decided to close his adventurous political life in these disturbed courts, and therefore left Tunis for Egypt in 784 A.H.

He then tells us about his life in Egypt, his relations with the Sultan, his appointment to the posts of professor and Maliki judge, the intrigues of his adversaries which ended in his removal from the post of judge, his journey to the holy land to perform the pilgrimage and his return to Cairo to devote his time to study and lecturing, and resume a solitary and tranquil life.

Here Ibn Khaldun closes the chapters of *Al-Taarif* in the current copy we have. But the Egyptian Library has an independent copy of it

which is more complete, entitled التعريف بابن خلدون و رحلته شرقا و غربا (Acquainting the reader with Ibn Khaldun and his journey to the East and the West), which has at the end a note that it was copied from the author's original copy.* There are in this copy several other chapters on the life of Ibn Khaldun in Egypt, in which he speaks at great length of his appointment to the posts of professor and judge, of his efforts to organize relations between the Sultan of Egypt and the Sultans of North Africa, of the internal events of Egypt at that time, of his journey to Syria on the suite of Al-Malik al-Nasir Faraj, of his audience with Timur the Emperor of the Tartars under the walls of Damascus, the conversations between them, and of the events of the Tartar conquest in that interval, including many philosophical and social explanations and arguments of some political phenomena and events in the method adopted in his Prolegomena. He then tells us of his return to Egypt to resume the post of judge more than once, and of his sufferings from the intrigues of his adversaries. Ibn Khaldun goes far in relating these events up to the end of the year 807 A.H., that is to say, only a few months before his death. These chapters fill about forty

* This copy is conserved in the Egyptian Library under No. 109, M. History.

large folios in the aforesaid manuscript copy;* the whole copy fills one hundred and forty-nine folios There are in the first part, which corresponds with the current copy of *Al-Taarif*, many additions which prove that Ibn Khaldun revised his autobiography during his sojourn in Egypt.

This *Al-Taarif* which Ibn Khaldun has left us to speak of himself and the events of his life, is a masterpiece of Arabic literature. It is a strong, delightful portrait of that distinguished enterprising personality, painted with a great deal of liberty and frankness; indeed, in many places, it reveals to us the psychological characteristics of the author, although they are not always compatible with morality. We find pride, ostentation and egoism, as well as ambition, fickleness, fondness for intrigues and opportunism by all means; and lastly ingratitude All these we notice clearly from time to time in the acts and attitudes of the historian as he himself relates them But these bad qualities are not very distant from the characteristics of a distinguished personality; indeed, they are generally

* These chapters cover pp 107 to 149 in the manuscript copy. They are, as given by Ibn Khaldun appointment as manager of the Khanqahs (Sufi institutes), appointment as manager of the Beibers Khanqah and removal, the Nasiri conspiracy, efforts to conclude friendly relations and presents between the Kings of North Africa and Al-Malik al-Zahir, Sultan's departure to Syria to repulse the Tartars, audience with Timur, Sultan of the Moguls and Tartars

those of the strong, vigorous policy; in other words, they are the elements of Machiavellism which occupy an important place among the doctrines of modern politics. At the same time they are coupled with many of the characteristics of genius. By the side of these we see audacity, intrepidity, strength of character, firmness and endurance, as well as great intelligence, sagacity, foresight, the power of convincing and, lastly, captivating eloquence. All these excellent qualities we also see in the acts and attitudes of Ibn Khaldun. In all this the historian speaks to us with frankness and simplicity worthy of admiration.

There is also the charming romantic side, and those dangerous adventures which the historian encountered in his life and which the ordinary man does not meet with. He goes from one place to another, passes through the dangers of vengeance, imprisonment and pursuit, and spends his political life in constant fear. He accompanies the army and stands by the side of his patron in military actions, and accomplishes dangerous missions in the depths of valleys and deserts. In Damascus, when seventy years old, he goes through new adventures, descends from the towers of a closed city, tied with a rope, and proceeds with audacity to the conqueror's camp. In Egypt we see him alone fighting his

numerous adversaries, and beating them more than once. Has not this sensational violent life its beauty and charm? In reading his *Al-Taarif* we are reminded of that famous autobiography which Benvenuto Cellini* left us about his wonderful life. There is much similarity between the two biographies although of different kinds. Both of them are full of occasions of audacity, risk, confidence and frankness. If the biography of the Italian artist is considered in European literature an excellent model of autobiography, and a beautiful picece of charming exposition and delightful romance, *Al-Taarif* of Ibn Khaldun occupies such a place in our Arabic literature.

III

All that came down to us of the legacy of Ibn Khaldun is his historical work, that is to say *Kitab al-Ibar* and *Al-Taarif*. But Ibn al-Khatib gives us in his biography of Ibn Khaldun, in his book *Al-Ihata fi Akhbar Gharnata*, another list of the works

* Benvenuto Cellini (1500-1571) was a famous Italian painter, sculptor and jeweller. He had a strange life full of daring and adventure. He left us his autobiography in a voluminous book, considered one of the masterpieces of the Renaissance.

of Ibn Khaldun. He tells us that "he wrote an excellent paraphrase of the *Burda*, summarized many of the books of Ibn Rushd (Averroes), made a good commentary on logic for the Sultan, summarized *Al-Muhassal* of Fakhr al-Din al-Razi, wrote a book on arithmetic, began to write a paraphrase of my poem about the principles of *Sharia* in an unsurpassed manner."* Ibn al-Khatib wrote this biography many years before Ibn Khaldun wrote his historical work, and therefore did not mention it. None of these works or treatises have reached us; it seems, in fact, that they were not well known and therefore not spoken of in the contemporary Egyptian biographies. It also seems that they were not of much importance and therefore Ibn Khaldun himself did not speak of them in his "Taarif."

* *Nafh al-Tib* (Bulak), p. 419. Al-Makkari copies the whole of this biography of Ibn Khaldun (pp. 414-26).

CHAPTER IV

Ibn Khaldun and Modern Criticism

The first hints of Western research on Ibn Khaldun Early studies about him and his works The translation of the Prolegomena Discovery of his theories and ideas Von Kremer's study Ibn Khaldun Kulturhistoriker Comments of Prof Schmidt and de Boer Ibn Khaldun, philosopher and sociologist Gumplowicz's analysis of his social theories Maunier on the Prolegomena Ibn Khaldun's positive philosophy His pessimism. Von Wesendonk on the application of his theories to Modern History Ibn Khaldun the Economist Prof Schmidt on Ibn Khaldun—Historian, Philosopher and Sociologist

WESTERN criticism has the highest opinion of the legacy of Ibn Khaldun. Western thought knew before Ibn Khaldun a great number of Moslem thinkers many of whom do not rise to his rank; it also knew before him many Moslem historians, not because they are more worthy of being studied, but because they appeared in the vigorous and flourishing ages of Islam, or because they treated subjects in which Western thought was interested.* But Ibn Khaldun

* The West knew historians such as Masudi, Abul Feda, Ibn al-Ibri, Ibn Khallikan and Ibn Arabshah long before Ibn Khaldun; some of their works were translated into Latin The Histories of Ibn al-Ibri and Ibn Arabshah were published in England based on their Arabic texts since the middle of the 17th century A.D.

appeared in an age when decay had crept into the power and domination of Islam, and Islamic thought had already declined. It was not the age worthy of study. The legacy of Ibn Khaldun remained thus in oblivion for centuries, both in East and West, hardly known to the first and totally ignored by the latter. In 1697 the first European biography of Ibn Khaldun appeared in D'Herbelot's *Bibliotheque Orientale.* It was, however, concise and full of errors. More than a century passed, before Western thought was interested in him. In 1806 the French orientalist, Sylvester de Sacy, published a biography of Ibn Khaldun, together with a translation of some passages of the Prolegomena, in his *Chrestomantie Arabe*, and a few years later he published the translation of some other passages of the Prolegomena. In 1816 he again published a lengthy biography of Ibn Khaldun in his *Biographie Universelle*, together with an ample description of the Prolegomena At the same time the Austrian orientalist, Von Hammer-Purgstall, published a treatise entitled *Ueber den Verfall des Islams nach den ersten drey Jahrhunderten der Hidschrat* in 1812 (on the Decline of Islam after the first three centuries of the Hijira), in which he particularly referred to some of Ibn Khaldun's theories on the decline of states, and described him

as "the Montesquieu of the Arabs." Afterwards he published a German translation of some passages of the Prolegomena, and later a description of some parts of the Prolegomena in the *Journal Asiatique* (1822). On the other hand De Sacy and some of his colleagues continued to publish translations of parts of the Prolegomena, and the History of Ibn Khaldun. In the meanwhile Western research was more and more interested in Ibn Khaldun and his works, and was admiring more and more the vigour and originality of his thought. At last Quatremere published, in 1858, the complete Arabic text of the Prolegomena, and some years later, De Sacy published its French translation in extenso. Ibn Khaldun appeared then to Western thought in his most astounding originality, and the value of his legacy, forgotten for centuries, was much appreciated.

From the middle of the 19th century European research began to study Ibn Khaldun and his social theories with special interest. That the West was acquainted with the legacy of Ibn Khaldun was a true scientific discovery, and the most astounding of it was that the West found in the legacy of the Moslem thinker many philosophical, social and economical theories, which Europe knew only long after Ibn Khaldun. It was thus that Western

research discovered, with astonishment and admiration, that Ibn Khaldun had studied many of those theories which were treated by Machiavelli a century later, and by Vico, Montesquieu, Adam Smith, and Auguste Comte,* some three or four centuries later. It was believed that Western research was the first to discover the philosophy of history and principles of Sociology and political Economy, but it was then found that Ibn Khaldun had long preceded the West, and had treated those subjects in his Prolegomena, and exposed many of their principles with intelligence and vigour. Thus Western research, after discovering and studying Ibn Khaldun, places his legacy most highly, considers him as a philosopher, historian of civilization, a scholar of sociology and political economy, and moreover acknowledges him to be the first to treat these subjects.

I

Western research was first interested in the philosophical side of History as exposed by Ibn

* Machiavelli, an Italian historian and politician (1469-1527), Vico, an Italian historian and philosopher (1668-1744) , Montesquieu, a French philosopher and sociologist (1669-1755) , Adam Smith, an English economist (1723-1790), and Auguste Comte, a French philosopher. He was the founder of the principles of positive philosophy (1798-1857).

Khaldun. But the social side, however, soon after began to draw the attention of sociologists, and to outweigh all other sides of his thought. Since the later part of the 19th century the social theories of Ibn Khaldun occupy an important place in contemporary criticism, and even to-day they afford a subject of study and comparative analysis for many social critics.

Foremost among the scholars, who studied the legacy of Ibn Khaldun from the philosophical historical side, was the great Austrian orientalist Baron Von Kremer, who wrote his famous treatise : *Ibn Chaldun und seine Kultur-Geschichte der islamischen Reiche*, " Ibn Khaldun and his history of the civilization of the Moslem Empire ", and presented it to the Academy of Sciences of the Vienna University in 1879. Von Kremer qualifies Ibn Khaldun as " Kulturhistoriker " (the Historian of Civilization), who wrote the history of the civilization of Moslem nations. In fact he was the first Moslem historian who devoted long chapters to the study of political institutions and forms of government and public institutions, such as justice, the police, administration, and their development in Moslem states, as well as to economical systems, commerce, customs, and taxes; then to professions, crafts, industries, and means of earning a living ; and lastly to science,

letters and arts, their forms, characteristics and development in the Moslem world. This conclusion is only true in a limited sense, for Ibn Khaldun does not study these questions independently or as being his principal subject, but treats them solely as being forms of "sociology" which is the main subject of his study. The phases of civilization are in fact a criterion to the phases of development of society.

This appellation of Ibn Khaldun by Von Kremer as "Kulturhistoriker" did not find much support among critics. Professor Schmidt, who is one of the latest critics of Ibn Khaldun, makes the following comment on this opinion: If it must be with certain reservations that Ibn Khaldun is classed as a "Kulturhistoriker," it is fair to consider whether, in this part of his work as well as in his political history, his main object may not have been to furnish illustrative examples and a collection elucidating what he regarded as the subject and the predicate of history, rather than a complete elaboration in accordance with the methods he recognized. In the earlier parts of the Prolegomena he sets forth at great length the things he really has at heart, the principles of historical criticism, the fundamental assumptions on which historic research must be based—above all, his conception of the

nature of history, its scope, its factors, its orderly sequences or laws. This grand and closely reasoned view of history as the record of man's social development, dependent on natural causes, and resulting from the impact of environment and the reaction of individual and group, would have made the book epoch-making, had not the civilization he described been doomed to a rapid decline, and the language in which he wrote been unknown to the young nations destined to carry out the work, so that the continuity of scientific progress became impossible and the makers of a new civilization had to find their way slowly, without the assistance he could have offered, to some of the lofty positions already occupied by him."*

The Dutch scholar, De Boer, considers Ibn Khaldun a philosopher, and ranks him among Moslem philosophers such as Avicenna, Al-Ghazali, Averroes, and Ibn Tufail; he emphasises the value of logic in forming his theories, and describes him as an excellent thinker. Ibn Khaldun, he remarks, denies rightly the value of Alchemy and prophecy, and often opposes the principles of intellectual philosophy, with the simple precepts of Islam, either through personal belief, or for political con-

* N Schmidt. *Ibn Khaldun, Historian, Sociologist and Philosopher* (New York, 1930), pp 15-16.

siderations. But his scientific theories were not influenced by Religion, as much as they were by Aristotle and Plato. The Republic of Plato, and the Platonic philosophy of Pythagoras as well as the works of his predecessors, particularly Al-Masudi, did much in the formation of his thought. Ibn Khaldun tried to find a new philosophical system, which did not even occur to Aristotle and to create from History a philosophical system. He says that this system is nothing but social life, all that society contains, as well as its intellectual culture. The task of history is to explain how people work, how they earn their living, why they fight one another, how they assemble in large congregations led by some chiefs and how they are lastly inspired with the desire for the culture of high arts and sciences, and how civilization develops from the primitive nomadic state to refined luxury, flourishes, and then declines and dies. Ibn Khaldun, continues De Boer, is undoubtedly the first who tried to explain fully the evolution and progress of Society, as being caused by certain causes and factors, and to expose the characteristics of race, climate, the means of production, etc., and their effects on the formation of man's mind and sentiment, as well as on the formation of Society. In the march of civilization he perceives

an organized internal harmony. De Boer concludes his study on Ibn Khaldun with the following words: "Ibn Khaldun's hope to have a successor who would continue his research was realized, but not in Islam. Being without a predecessor, he remained also without a successor."*

II

Western criticism, however, was more interested in the social philosophy of Ibn Khaldun. In this domain Ibn Khaldun attained the utmost admiration and appreciation; and many contemporary sociologists tried to analyse his social theories and compare them with those of the masters of sociology.

Among these was the learned professor Ludwig Gumplowicz of the University of Graz. In his social studies he devotes for Ibn Khaldun a long chapter and considers him as a sociologist. He studies many of his theories, compares them with those of modern sociologists, and explains how he proceeded with many of them. He has, for example, discovered the theory of the three generations concerning the rise and decline of families, long before Ottokar Lorenz, who studied it only at the end of

* T. J. de Boer: *Geschichte der Philosophie im Islam* (1901), pp. 177-84.

the 19th century. But Gumplowicz says that Ibn Khaldun attains the summit of social investigation when he exposes his observations on the reciprocal action of social groups and that these groups themselves are the production of the *milieu*. In this domain his ideas about the conquering races are most important. His observations about the *milieu* and its effects prove that he knew the 'law of assimilation' five centuries before Darwin.* The fact that he emphasises the submission of man to the general laws which govern the animals shows that he knew Monism long before Haeckel.† It is astonishing to see how the measures recommended to victorious conquerors by Ibn Khaldun for maintaining their domination, concord with those in military organizations which, according to modern historical research, were resorted to by the founders of European states in the Middle Ages. At any rate the priority must be rightly attributed to the Arab Sociologist, with regard to these counsels which Machiavelli, a century later, gave to rulers in his *Prince*. Even in this cold manner of studying things, and in this very rude realism, Ibn Khaldun

* Charles Darwin, (1809-82), an English naturalist, celebrated for his theories about the origin of species

† Ernest Haeckel (1834-1919), a German biologist and naturalist, famous for his studies and new theories about the origin of species.

could have served as a model to the intelligent Italian, who undoubtedly knew nothing about him. Moreover Ibn Khaldun was able to establish, five centuries before, the origin of the two powers, the spiritual and the temporal, in the same manner as our professors of political and canon Law. Gumplowicz concludes with the following words: " I wanted to show that long before not only Auguste Comte, but also Vico, whom the Italians wanted forcibly to consider as the first European Sociologist, a pious Moslem studied with perspicacity the social phenomena, and expressed profound ideas on this subject. What he wrote is what we term to-day as ' Sociology ' "*

At the same time, when Gumplowicz expressed these ideas, an Italian sociologist, Ferreiro, studied the theories of Ibn Khaldun, and confirmed Gumplowicz in considering him a 'sociologist', and extolled his originality and priority.† The Russian sociologist Levine expressed the same idea and considers Ibn Khaldun a ' social ' philosopher.

M. Maunier, a French scholar, studies Ibn Khaldun from both the economical and social sides, in two vigorous articles, the first devoted to Ibn

* L. Gumplowicz *Un Sociologiste arabe au XIVeme siecle* (dans Apercus Sociologistiques), pp. 201-26.

† A. Ferreiro *Un Sociologo arabo del secolo XIV*, (La Riforma Sociale, 1896).

Khaldun's economical theories, and the other to his social theories. M. Maunier considers Ibn Khaldun at the same time as philosopher, economist and sociologist. He describes his Prolegomena and his thought as follows: "It is a great mixture of universal laws, and an encyclopædia of the sciences of the age. It contains the miscellaneous elements of a complete study on Sociology. Its method is particularly excellent, and reveals a true scientific spirit. If the ideas of Ibn Khaldun do not express a positive ideal, they are nevertheless based on analytical observation of events and are the mirror of facts. His Philosophy is nothing but the explanation of his History, and his interpretations reveal a positive spirit with which our philosopher was in advance of his age."* M. Maunier then proceeds to analyse Ibn Khaldun's social theories, and divides them into two sections: the general laws of social life, and the social laws of evolution, and concludes: "It seems that the social Philosophy of Ibn Khaldun is tinted with great pessimism. Society is nothing but a while in the universal current of things; it goes away as every thing does. Life is like a rhythm; every change necessitates the contrary; every rise is followed by a fall... But the

* R. Maunier: *Les idees sociologiques d'un philosophe arabe au XIV, siecle* (L'Egypte contemporaine, 1917), p. 31.

pessimism of Ibn Khaldun is that of an indifferent and resigned eye-witness. He does not judge; he observes, and in this he proves to be of true scientific spirit, and that a place must be reserved for him in the history of positive Sociology."*

Most of the critics of Ibn Khaldun observe this pessimism which characterises his Philosophy. Von Kremer says that this pessimism is pushed by Ibn Khaldun into extreme limits, and compares him in this respect to Abul Ala al-Maarri. He thinks that this sentiment is due to the fact that Moslem countries and civilization were in a state of decline at the time of Ibn Khaldun. But Ferreiro, however, attributes it to the conditions of the stormy political life which Ibn Khaldun led, and to the bitterness and disappointment he suffered from it. Much of the realism of his philosophy is due to this sentiment; his pessimism was not a personal disposition inherent in his character, but only a quality of his thought, and the result of study and research. Ibn Khaldun was, as is shown by his eventful life, more confident, jovial and optimistic.

The German critic Von Wesendonk studies the theories of Ibn Khaldun on the rise and decline of states, and describes him as the most original

* R Maunier · *Les idees sociologiques d'un philosophe arabe au XIV, siecle* (L'Egypte contemporaine, 1917), p 31

spirit, an ideal in Arabic thought, and the last star which shined on the horizon of Moslem liberal thought. He considers him, as Von Kremer does, a 'Kulturhistoriker', and qualifies him rightly as a master of the Machiavelli and Vico Schools. He tries to apply his theories regarding the fall of states and dynasties to the German Empire and other European states and concludes thus : "It seems to the German, at the present time, that these ideas, imbibed with pessimism, are not the invention of a foreign thinker. The German Empire did not last long ; in its flowery youth, it broke up with extraordinary rapidity. Should we try to attribute this tragedy to causes other than those to which Ibn Khaldun attributes the fall of the Almoravides and Almohades? The theories of Ibn Khaldun offer a valuable opportunity for contemplation ; the great Moslem Kulturhistoriker stands alone in the East, without any successor or disciple. His theories and conclusions may be applied most fully and rightly to the state of Europe in the 19th century. The ideas and dispositions of the African thinker and statesman have their echo on the course of events, whatever may be their direction, an echo which has its impression on contemporary thought."*

* Von Wesendonk *Ibn Khaldun, ein arabischer Kulturhistoriker des XIV, Jahrhunderts,* (Deutsche Rundschau, Januar 1923)

III

Stefano Colosio studied Ibn Khaldun from the economical side. Colosio remarks at first that " Ibn Khaldun, as regards the race from which he descended, the country where he was born, and the civilization to which he belonged, may be ranked among great men who occupy the highest place in History." Ibn Khaldun discovered new fields in Sociology, but he does not compete with Machiavelli as a Historian, for he did not know, or did not try to apply those principles he exposed in his Prolegomena, in order to explain the causes of events related in his History. He preceded, however, Machiavelli, Montesquieu, and Vico, in discovering the principles of a new science, *i.e.*, the critical study of history. This is a fact, which the great Italian orientalist and historian, Amari, pointed to before Colosio, when he described Ibn Khaldun as the first writer in the world who treated the 'philosophy of History.' Colosio then reviews the theory of Ibn Khaldun on 'social determination', and states that it is exposed in these words with which Ibn Khaldun begins his study about nomadic and civilized generations : " The difference

of generations in their conditions is based on the difference of their modes of living.*

Colosio extols particularly the economical theories of Ibn Khaldun. "The great Berber Historian," he says, "was able to discover in the Middle Ages the principles of social justice and political economy before Considerant, Marx, and Baconine."† He then analyses the ideas of Ibn Khaldun about the state's work in the economical field, and its bad effects; about the political forces, and social classes, the methods and sorts of property, the social task of labour, its division into free and paid labour, the fact that free labour is a source of wealth, and lastly about the law of supply and demand. In all this, remarks Colosio, Ibn Khaldun was an original economist who understands the principles of political economy, and applies it with intelligence and skill, long before it was known to Western research. Colosio concludes with the following words: "If the theories of Ibn Khaldun, about the complex life of society, place him foremost among the philosophers of History, his com-

* *The Prolegomena*, p 101.

† Considerant, a French socialist who wrote many works on Socialism (1808-93), Karl Marx, a famous German economist and socialist, author of the greatest book on Socialism *Das Kapital* (1818-83); and Baconine a Russian sociologist and economist and founder of the principles of Anarchy (1814-76).

prehension of the part played by labour, property and wages, places him foremost among the masters of modern Economy."*

IV

One of the most recent critical studies of Ibn Khaldun is a treatise by professor Nathaniel Schmidt of Cornell University (U.S.A.), in which he studies Ibn Khaldun as a historian, sociologist and philosopher. Professor Schmidt considers that Ibn Khaldun as a historian, may be fairly compared with universal historians as Diodorus of Sicily, Nicolaus of Damascus, or Trogus Pompeius of the early Christian era, or with authors like Gatterer and Schlozer in the eighteenth century, although there can be no question that he was their superior both in the use of older sources and in original contributions. Had Ibn Khaldun left behind nothing but his political history, it would have been a monument of untiring industry, vast erudition, and keen judgment. For certain periods it would have remained an invaluable source of information. But even the abandonment of the

* S. Colosio *Contribution a l'etude d'Ibn Khaldoun,* (Revue du Monde Musulman, XXVI, 1914).

annalistic method would not have raised him greatly above the level of such men as Bochari, Masudi, Tabari and Ibn al-Athir. Ibn Khaldun's title to enduring fame, however, does not rest on his History. It is bound up with that remarkable product of his pen, the Prolegomena to his History. Here his genius reveals itself in its full splendour. Here he scatters with lavish bands the ripe fruits of his reflection on the course of human history.*

As regards the philosophy of history, Professor Schmidt remarks that if Ibn Khaldun regards himself as the discoverer of the live space and nature of history, he is, no doubt, correct in maintaining that in the Moslem world no one has preceded him in this discovery. Our acquaintance with antiquity is incomparably greater. Yet so far, as we know to-day, he was indeed the first writer to define the field of history and to look upon history as a special science dealing with the facts that fall within its domain. In fact, nowhere does the conception of history appear as a special science having for its object all the social phenomena of man's life. This is Ibn Khaldun's contention. If it is proper to extend the scope of history, and if history is a science, the great Tunisian, who laid down and defended these propositions, seems in this

* N. Schmidt *Ibn Khaldun, Historian, Sociologist and Philosopher*, p. 14.

respect to have had no predecessor, and it may well be claimed that he was the discoverer. Herein lies, no doubt, his most original contribution, though his keen mind opened new paths in many directions. In seeking for the causes of the rise and fall of political governments, he realized that they could not be looked for solely in the motives and ambitions, the aims and purposes, the strength of will and intellectual power of individuals. He observed that their influence was determined, not only by the character of the groups to which they belonged, but also by the general social conditions. This led him to consider the factors that influenced and shaped these social conditions. He recognized that they were due to ethnic and racial characteristics. But the perceived likewise that these peculiarities were themselves traceable to the physical environment, climate, water, soil, location and food. To understand the political development it was, therefore, necessary to include in the study all aspects of social life and to understand which it was needful to take into account the physical factors. Hence the widening of the scope of history, and the broadening of the historian's task. History becomes the science of human society. It is sociology. Ibn Khaldun, continues professor Schmidt, is in spite of his Moslem orthodoxy, a philosopher as much

as Auguste Comte, Thomas Buckle, or Herbert Spencer. His philosophy of history is not a theodicy as Hegel's.* There are indeed numerous quotations from the Koran, inserted in appropriate connections. But they add nothing to the argument and have no vital relation to it. They may have been designed to give the impression of concordance with the Holy Writ.

As regards the social side, Schmidt like most critics, considers Ibn Khaldun the founder of Sociology. He particularly agrees with Gumplowicz that Sociology existed long before Auguste Comte, that Ibn Khaldun went beyond him in certain conclusions, and that he was foremost in studying the effects of habit, climate, soil and food, etc., as compared with Montesquieu, Buckle, Spencer and others. He quotes the words of the Spanish scholar Altamirce: "It is sufficient that in the fifteenth century, when the European historiography was still so deficient and so alien to conceptions of the character Ibn Khaldun expounds and defends, there should have been written a book like the Prolegomena, in which all the problems are treated

* Thomas Buckle, an English social historian, his work on the history of English civilization is well known (1821-62), Spencer, an English philosopher, founder of the philosophy of evolution (1820-1903), and Hegel, a German philosopher, who studied specially philosophy of Religion and spirit (1770-1831).

or suggested which, in a more discursive manner, have come to constitute the principal preoccupation of modern historians."*

Sufficient has been quoted of the Western criticism about the legacy of Ibn Khaldun and his thought. Western criticism, as we have seen, raises his legacy to the highest level of appreciation and admiration, and ranks his thought among the loftiest and most valuable fruits of human thought.

* Schmidt : *Ibn Khaldun*, p. 26

CHAPTER V

Ibn Khaldun and Machiavelli

Points of similarity between Machiavelli and Ibn Khaldun. Social philosophy of Machiavelli as exposed in his " Prince ". Its relation to the subject of state policy treated by the Arabs. The practical side in his philosophy. Machiavelli on the qualities of the " Ideal Prince ". Cruelty and violence of Machiavellism Common ideas of Machiavelli and Ibn Khaldun. Ibn Khaldun master of the Machiavellist School. Was Machiavelli influenced by Ibn Khaldun or any other Moslem thinker? Was Al-Hassan ibn al-Wazzan the link of this influence? Improbability of this hypothesis. The two thinkers were both original.

MORE than a century after the death of Ibn Khaldun, Nicolo Machiavelli, the great Italian historian and statesman,* wrote a book which occupies in Western thought the same high place which the Prolegomena of Ibn Khaldun occupies in Islamic thought. This is the *Prince*

* Nicolo Machiavelli was born at Florence in 1469 and died in 1537 He worked for some time as a foreign secretary to the government of Florence, and was charged with many political missions in Italy, France and Germany. When the Medici resumed their rule in Florence in 1512, he was arrested, being accused of conspiracy, and suffered torture. He was then released through the intervention of Pope Leo X. He abandoned political life and wrote many works, among which was his famous *Prince*, *Florentine History*, studies about Titus Livius, and many political treatises and dramas.

(Il principe). It is, like the work of Ibn Khaldun, a wonderful piece of political and social study, characterized by much vigour and extreme originality. If there are not many points of material similarity between the two works, there are, on the other hand, many points of moral similarity, and there is particularly a strong resemblance between the two spirits as regards the circumstances and environment where they were formed, their understanding of History and social phenomena, and lastly their power of exposition and supplying the testimony of historical events.

Many of the causes of this similarity between the two great thinkers could be attributed to strange resemblance in the times, and political and social circumstances in which both of them lived. The Italian principalities and republics, under whose ægis Machiavelli lived, offer in Italy the same political aspects and organizations as offered by the North African kingdoms in the days of Ibn Khaldun, as regards their feuds and rivalries, their ambitions to conquer one another, and the successive passing of their sovereignty into the hands of some chieftains and usurpers. Machiavelli came in touch with these states, and passed some time in the service of one of them, *i.e.*, Florence, and was sent on different political missions. He was able to

study closely many of the important political events and upheavals which took place at that time, and to make from this study a material for his reflections on the state and the prince, while Ibn Khaldun made from the events of his time a material for study and reflection.

The Moslem thinker is, however, richer in material, and wider in outlook, than the Italian thinker. Indeed Ibn Khaldun considers Society in general, and all the phenomena that it presents—the subject of his study—and tries to understand these phenomena and analyse them through the light of History and, lastly, to conclude from their successive rhythm and their interaction, some general social laws. But Machiavelli studies the State only, or rather studies certain categories of states, namely those which are presented by the ancient Greek and Roman history, and by the Italian history of his time. He studies the personality of the Prince or the conqueror who rules a state, the good or bad qualities which are attached to that personality and the methods of government which are available to it. This limited study forms only a little part of the much more comprehensive study of Ibn Khaldun, *i.e.*, the third chapter of Book I of the "Prolegomena," where he speaks about the general conditions of states, monarchy,

and monarchical functions. And even in this limited range, Ibn Khaldun surpasses Machiavelli greatly, and discovers the theory of 'vitality' (Asabiyah), and that of the age of states, and studies the characteristics of the states from the social point of view. Machiavelli on the other hand surpasses Ibn Khaldun in the fluency of his logic, the precision of exposition and conclusion, and the beauty of his style.

Machiavelli wrote his *Prince* in 1513, and dedicated it to Lorenzo de Medici, Prince of Florence. He explains the purpose of writing the book in his letter of dedication to the prince in the following words: "And although I may consider this work unworthy of your countenance, nevertheless I trust much to your benignity that it may be acceptable, seeing that it is not possible for me to make a better gift than to offer you the opportunity of understanding in the shortest time all that I have learnt in so many years, and with so many troubles and dangers." And adds: "Take then, your Magnificence, this little gift in the spirit in which I send it, wherein, if it be diligently read and considered, you will learn my extreme desire that you should attain that greatness which fortune and your other attributes promise."* Thus Machiavelli tried to offer through his *Prince*, a guide to the princes of his time,

* *The Prince*, (Everyman's), pp 2-3.

to explain to them the best methods of government, and the best means of maintaining their power over the people they rule. The opinions and theories of Machiavelli are inspired by the events of ancient history, particularly by the events of his time which he witnessed and studied, and from which he concludes certain general laws, in the same manner as Ibn Khaldun who makes similar conclusions by studying society. The studies of Machiavelli are concise. He begins by speaking about the different kinds of principalities, and the means by which they are acquired; the manner to govern cities or principalities which lived under their own laws before they were annexed; the principalities which are acquired by one's own arms and ability, and those which are acquired by the arms of others or by good fortune or by wickedness; the ecclesiastical and temporal principalities; the kinds of soldiery and mercenaries, and that which concerns a prince on the subject of the art of war. Machiavelli speaks then of the personality of the prince, the qualities for which princes are praised or blamed, liberality and meanness, cruelty and clemency, the way in which princes should keep faith, what they should do in order to avoid being despised and hated, how a prince should conduct himself in order to gain renown, the secretaries of princes, how flattery

should be avoided, why the princes of Italy have lost their states, what fortune can effect in human affairs and, lastly, on the necessity to liberate Italy from the yoke of foreigners or the Barabinans as he calls them.

These are the items which form the subject of Machiavellian philosophy on states and princes. It appears, particularly from the writings of Machiavelli on the *Prince*, that he studied a subjact which was treated by Moslem thinkers long before Ibn Khaldun. We mean the " monarchical politics ", a subject which developed, since the third century of the Hijira, in Islamic thought into a special study or science : the science of politics as explained in a preceding chapter. As we have mentioned, the science of politics was understood by the Arabs in the early ages of Islam in a very limited sense, *i.e.*, to study the good qualifications which a prince must enjoy, and the defects which he must avoid, in order to be fit for the presidency of a state or the accession of a throne, and be able to rule with power and capacity. Moslem thinkers then developed the meaning of politics, divided them into many kinds, studied 'monarchical politics' from the legal and administrative points as well as the position of the prince from the legal point, and the monarchical functions. What the Italian

thinker says about the qualifications, qualities, and duties of the *Prince*, may be compared with this study of politics by Moslem thinkers since the later part of the third century of the Hijira. The subject was treated by Ibn Kutayba in his *Uyun al-Akhbar*, by Al-Mawardi in his *Al-Ahkam al-Sultaniyah*, by Al-Turtushi in his *Siraj al-Muluk*, by Al-Ghazali in his *Al-Tibr al-Masbuk* and, lastly, by Ibn al-Tiqtaqa in his *Al-Adab al-Sultaniyah.* In his study about the general conditions of the state and monarchy Ibn Khaldun treats the same subject, speaks about the essence of sovereignty and its kinds, the meaning of Caliphate and Imamate, and the different principles and theories appertaining to them and, lastly, about the monarchical functions.* His study is characterized by those social conclusions and reflections which did not occur to any of his predecessors.

Machiavelli, on the other hand, reveals in his study a realistic rude spirit, while Moslem thinkers speak about the prince or ruler as he must be, and about his ideal qualities as they must be, the Italian thinker studying his *Ideal Prince* from a purely practical point. He describes him as he is in fact, and paints his ideal qualities with realistic colours. He draws his conclusions from any success achieved

* *The Prolegomena*, pp. 156, 158 and the following.

or any failure suffered by the prince, either personally or through his qualities, without any consideration if these portraits or qualities are compatible with the ideal principles of morality as they were conceived through the ages. Whence this gloomy colour which stamps Machiavellism, and the severity, cruelty and wickedness which characterize its political theories, and make it to our days a striking example to treacherous policy, without conscience or scruples, deprived of all impartiality and abstention, and disregarding all human and moral considerations. Here are some specimens of the opinions which envelop the philosophy of Machiavelli and his 'Ideal Prince' with dark colour:

(1) And again he (the Prince) need not make himself uneasy at incurring a reproach for those vices without which the state can only be saved with difficulty, for if everything is considered carefully, it will be found that something which looks like virtue, if followed, would be his ruin; whilst something else, which looks like vice, yet followed, brings him security and prosperity.

(2) And there is nothing which wastes so rapidly as liberality, for even whilst you exercise it you lose the power to do so, and so become either poor or despised, or else, in avoiding poverty, rapacious

and hated. And a prince should guard himself, above all things, against being despised or hated; and liberality leads you to both. Therefore it is wiser to have a reputation for meanness which brings reproach without hatred, than to be compelled through seeking a reputation for liberality to incur a name for rapacity which begets reproach with hatred.

(3) Cæsar Borgia was considered cruel; notwithstanding his cruelty reconciled the Romagna, unified it, and restored it to peace and loyalty. And if this is rightly considered he will be seen to have been much more merciful than the Florentine people who, to avoid a reputation for cruelty, permitted Pistoia to be destroyed. Therefore a prince, so long as he keeps his subjects united and loyal, ought not to mind the reproach of cruelty, because with a few examples he will be more merciful than those who, through too much mercy, allow disorders to arise, from which follow murder or robbery.

(4) Upon this a question arises: whether it is better to be loved than feared or *vice versa*? It may be answered that one should wish to be both but, because it is difficult to unite them in one person, it is much safer to be feared than loved, when one of the two must be dispensed with.

(5) Therefore a wise lord cannot, nor ought he to, keep faith when such observance may be turned against him, and when the reasons that caused him to pledge it exist no longer.

(6) Therefore it is unnecessary for a prince to have all the good qualities I have enumerated, but it is very necessary to appear to have them... And you have to understand this, that a prince, especially a new one, cannot observe all those things for which men are esteemed, being often forced, in order to maintain the state, to act contrary to fidelity, friendship, humanity, and religion. Therefore it is necessary for him to have a mind ready to turn itself accordingly as the winds and variations of fortune force it.

(7) And, speaking of the policy of Ferdinand the Catholic of Spain against the Moors after the fall of Granada, he says: "Always using religion as a plea, so as to undertake greater schemes, he devoted himself with a pious cruelty to driving out and clearing his kingdom of the Moors; nor could there be a more admirable example, nor one more rare."*

From these concise specimens we can understand the spirit of Machiavellism in conceiving the state and the prince. Machiavellism is based on realistic facts, and these facts, however rude or monstrous

* *The Prince*, pp 123, 130, 133-34, 142-44 and 178.

they may be, occupy the first place in the foundation of the state and the policy of the prince. Hypocrisy, avarice, meanness, cruelty, terror, treachery, breaking promises, disregarding fidelity, friendship, honesty and religion, and crushing every moral or human ideal—all these are not condemned by Machiavellism, and are not considered as vices. Thus, for Machiavelli, the ideal prince and the ideal statesman, are tyrants, who resort to the most ruthless and monstrous means in maintaining their power, such as Pope Alexander VI, and his son Cæsar Borgia (Duke of Valenteno).* Machiavelli traces in a special chapter some episodes of the life of Cæsar Borgia, whom he knew and served. He declares his admiration for those sanguinary projects and methods which Cæsar organized for the destruction of his enemies, princes or generals, and their treacherous murder. Hence this gloomy stamp which brands Machiavellist policy until our day. But, in fact, the Italian thinker reveals, in framing his philosophy, much vigour, skill, and far-sightedness. These theories and principles, which may be condemned from the platonic point of view, were always, and are still, the basis of triumphant

* Pope Alexander VI or Alexander Borgia occupied the papal throne from 1442-1503; his son Cæsar, master of Romagna and other Italian provinces, was born in 1476 and died after a very eventful life in 1507, he is renowned for his audacity, treachery and awful cruelty

policies. They are the symbol of the vigorous, realistic policy even up to our day.

* * *

Ibn Khaldun, as already said, devoted many chapters to the subject of state and sovereignty, and studied it from larger and more far reaching points of view, and greatly surpasses Machiavelli in studying it from the social side. The two thinkers, however, agree on many points. For example, the remarks of Ibn Khaldun in the beginning of the Prolegomena about the value of History in studying the conditions of nations; then his remarks about the effects of tyranny and arbitrary policy on the minds of people; the qualities of the princes, whether they are moderate or exaggerated, the defence of the state and the devotion of the soldiery, the competition of a prince with his people in commerce and gain, his covetousness for the money of his people and the effect thereof in inciting public fury, the creeping of anarchy into the state and the assaults of soldiery on peoples' property and lastly, his remarks about the secretaries of the prince (the Sultan).* These are all points or items which Machivelli studies or approaches, either in his *Prince*, or in his work about the history of

* *The Prolegomena*, pp. 7, 141, 157-58, 235, 239, 248 and 205.

Florence *(Istorie Fiorentine)*, where many philosophical and social reflections are to be found.* Machiavelli may not always agree with Ibn Khaldun, either in conclusions or in the way of exposition, but many of the opinions of the Moslem thinker find their echo in the ideas of the Italian thinker. Indeed Ibn Khaldun was the master of the political and social study, which Machiavelli, a century later, treated partially. He was the first man to study the social phenomena, to understand and explain the events of history, and to conclude from them social laws, in such a wonderful scientific manner.

" At any rate," says Professor Gumplowicz, " the priority must be rightly attributed to the Arab sociologist (Ibn Khaldun) as regards those counsels which Machiavelli, a century later, gave to rulers in his *Prince*. Even in this cold manner of studying things, and in this very rude realism, Ibn Khaldun could have served as a model to the intelligent Italian who undoubtedly knew nothing about him."† Colosio says in comparing Ibn Khaldun with Machiavelli : " If the great Florentine instructs us in the art of governing people, he makes this

* Compare the remarks of Machiavelli on similar subjects in the *Prince*, pp. 98, 108, 118, 126, 135, 149 and 183

† Gumplowicz : *Apercus Sociologiques*, p. 217.

as a far-sighted politician, but the learned Tunisian (Ibn Khaldun), was able to penetrate into the social phenomena, as a profound economist and philosopher, a fact which urges us to see in his work such a far-sightedness and critical art, as was totally unknown to his age."*

Lastly we may ask whether the Italian thinker ever knew anything of Ibn Khaldun's work, or of any other works of Moslem thinkers on 'Monarchical politics', and whether he profited by them? We think, with Gumplowicz, that when Machiavelli wrote his *Prince*, he knew nothing of Ibn Khaldun and his works and that he knew as well nothing of the works of Moslem thinkers on the subject. It is true that some shades of Moslem thought were known in Italy before Machiavelli and during his time. There were some old cultural relations between the Moslems of Spain and North Africa, and the intellectual societies of Italy, and many Moslem works had been translated into Latin. But in Machiavelli's work there are no traces, whatever, that he knew Ibn Khaldun or any other Moslem thinker on his subject. If there are many points of similarity between the two thinkers as regards their comprehension and analysis of History, their study of events, and their social conclusions,

* Colosio *Introduction a l'etude d'Ibn Khaldoun*

this can be attributed, as explained before, to a great similarity in the times and circumstances in which both lived and, lastly, to similarity in the political maturity which both acquired by participating in the events of their time, and serving the princes and statesmen of the age. It may be that Machiavelli heard of Ibn Khaldun and his Prolegomena towards the end of his life, ten years after writing his *Prince*, about 1523 or 1524. At that time the Moorish converted writer, Al-Hassan ibn Muhammad al-Wazzan, known as Leo Africanus, was living in Rome, and wandering in the North of Italy. He was born at Granada about 1495, educated at Fez, and was charged by its Court with some political missions. In 1516 he went for pilgrimage to Mecca and returned by way of Constantinople. While on his way back to Morocco he was caught by a band of Sicillian pirates, and carried to Rome, where the Pope converted him under the name of Johannes Leo. He then devoted himself to research and composition, and wrote an Arabic-Latin Dictionary, as well as his famous work on the "Description of Africa", which he afterwards translated into Italian. He was at Bologna (in the North of Italy) near Florence, in 1524, according to an information inserted at the end of his Latin dictionary, of which there is a

copy in his own handwriting in the Escurial.* It is possible, indeed probable, that Ibn al-Wazzan met and knew Machiavelli in Rome, the then highest centre of thought and letters. In fact Machiavelli was in Rome in 1525; he went there to present his *Florentine History* to his friend and patron Pope Clement VII, (Giuliano de Medici). If the hypothesis of the meeting of the two men is right, it may be possible to say that Machiavelli knew something about Moslem works. Ibn al-Wazzan must have spoken about them among his Italian friends. It is also very probable that Ibn Khaldun was foremost among the Moslem thinkers, who may have been the subject of such conversations as his fame was still very great in North Africa, where Ibn al-Wazzan passed his youth and made his studies. But whatever may be the truth of such hypothesis we cannot say that Machiavelli was influenced in formulating his political and social philosophy by any works of Moslem origin; no such influence whatever could be traced in his work. He was undoubtedly an original thinker, as was also Ibn Khaldun. Each of the two great thinkers paved his own way, and enjoyed his own inspiration. The *Prince* was a great conquest in the thought of the Renaissance as the Prolegomena was a great conquest in Moslem thought.

* See Casiri's *Bibliotheca Arabo Hispana Escurialensis*, Vol. I, p 172.

APPENDIX

Bibliographic Review of Ibn Khaldun's Historical Work, "Kitab al-Ibar"

Publication of the first parts of Ibn Khaldun's work The Prolegomena appears in Paris and Cairo The Bulak edition. Significance of the dedication Translation and manuscripts

I

IBN Khaldun's work remained unpublished till the middle of the last century, in spite of its value and importance without any general circulation with the exception of some small parts and selected chapters from his Prolegomena and History, which were translated and published occasionally. From this time onwards scholars gave more care to the publication of his work. The first large part of his History, dealing with the history of the Aghlabites and Moslem domination in Sicily, was published in 1841 by Noel des Vergers, together with a French translation, under the title: *Histoire de l'Afrique sous les Aghlabites et la Sicile sous la Domination musulmane.* In 1858 the Prolegomena

appeared in Paris in three volumes, edited by Quatremere after a manuscript of the Royal Library, within the collection known as "*Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliotheque du Roi*", occupying volumes XVI to XIX. At the same time the Prolegomena was published in Cairo for the first time in 1274 A.H. (1858 A.D.) by Shaikh Nasr Alhurainy after another manuscript, whose preface contains a passage of dedication which is not contained in the Paris manuscript. The Prolegomena was then published in Beirut in 1879, and was afterwards published several times. The Bůlak (Cairo) Government Press then published Ibn Khaldun's whole work *Kitab al-Ibar*, appearing successively in seven large volumes, the last appearing in 1284 A.H. (1868 A.D.). It was published after several manuscripts all lacking some parts, but completing each other. The Prolegomena was copied from the edition of 1274 A.H. containing the aforesaid passage of dedication. This passage throws particular light on the history and value of the copy which contains it. There the author dedicates this copy of his book to the Library of "his master, Sultan Abu Faris, Abd al-Aziz ibn Abil Hassan of Banu Mareen" and says that he "sends it to their prosperous Library for scholars in the Quarauiyin Mosque at Fez, their capital." This Sultan Abd

al-Aziz is the son of Ibn Abil Abbas, son of Ibn Abi Salem, son of Sultan Abil Hassan. He ascended the throne of Morocco in 796 A.H. and died in Safar 799 A.H. The dedication by Ibn Khaldun of his book to Sultan Abd al-Aziz must have occurred in this interval of 796-799 A.H. Modern research has already found two volumes of this copy sent by Ibn Khaldun to Fez; they are still conserved in the Library of the Quarauiyin Mosque, and were discovered by M. Alfred Bel, who mentions them in his catalogue of the Library of the Quarauiyin Mosque, and states that one of them carries the formula of Waqf.* M. Levy-Provencal then verified the authenticity of this discovery in an article published in the "Journal Asiatique", together with a fac-simile of the aforesaid Waqf formula, which is dated the 21st Safar, 799 A.H. At the end of this volume the calligraphist states that he "copied it from the approved original of the author".† The presentation of this copy by Ibn Khaldun took place at the time when Sultan Al-Zahir Barquq, king of Egypt, sent his presents to the sultans of North Africa, as a result of the relations which Ibn Khaldun tried to organize between

* A. Bel: *Catalogue des livres arabes de la Bibliotheque de la mosquee de El-Quarauiyin a Fez*, p. 6

† *Journal Asiatique* (Juillet-Septembre), pp 163-64

the Egyptian Court and the Berber Courts. Ibn Khaldun sent this copy of his book to Morocco with the emissaries of Sultan Al-Zahir. Meanwhile Sultan Abd al-Aziz died, but the news of his death were not yet known in Cairo. It is certain that this copy presented by Ibn Khaldun to his previous masters and patrons, the Banu Mareen, was one of the most complete and best revised copies of his work. Fifteen years had passed since Ibn Khaldun wrote the first copy of his work. During his stay in Cairo, in this interval, he made many corrections and additions in his work. This revision comprised all the sections of the book; and Ibn Khaluun was able, in many places, to follow contemporary events till the years 795, 796 and 797 A.H. as has been previously explained. There is in the Egyptian Library (Mustapha Pasha Collection) a manuscript copy of *Kitab al-Ibar*, in ten volumes, and lacking one volume (the seventh of the edited copy). Its preface contains the passage of dedication mentioned above, which appears to prove that it might have been copied from the original copy presented to the Court of Fez.*

The Bulak copy of *Kitab al-Ibar* is, therefore, one of the most complete of the known copies of Ibn Khaldun's work in spite of its many typographical

* This copy is preserved under No. 65, Hist. M.

errors and gaps.

II

After the publication of the Prolegomena in 1858 by Quatremere, it was translated into French by Baron de Slane; a work which was originally intended by Quatremere, but remained unachieved on account of his death. The French version of M. de Slane appeared in 1863-68, in three large volumes under the title: "*Les Prolegomenes d'Ibn Khaldoun* par M. de Slane, Membre de l'Institut". De Slane followed the Arabic version edited by Quatremere, with few exeptions, where he made a comparison with other manuscripts. He begins by translating Ibn Khaldun's autobiography (Al-Taarif) and then completes his biography till his death, by consulting the Egyptian contemporary sources, (Makrizi, Al-Aini, Ibn Qadi Shohba). De Slane complains of Ibn Khaldun's style, saying that it is weak and often ambiguous, and that he uses so many pronouns, that it is some times difficult to understand him.* In fact there is much ambiguity in de Slane's translation; it is not right, however, to attribute this to the obscurity of the original

* De Slane *Les Prolegomenes d'Ibn Khaldoun*, Vol. I, p. 112.

text, but is due in most cases to the weakness of the French version itself.

De Slane also published a large section of Ibn Khaldun's History, *i.e.*, that which concerns the history of the Berber kingdoms, in two large volumes entitled: "*Tarikh al-Dowal al-Islamiyah bil-Maghrib*" (Algiers, 1863): he consulted many manuscripts, abridging the text in some places, and making additions from other authors. Some years before, de Slane had published a French version of this section, which appeared in four volumes in Algiers (1852-1856) under the title: *Histoire des Berberes et des Dynasties musulmanes de l'Afrique Septentrionale.*

The Prolegomena was translated into Turkish early in the eighteenth century by Perizade, who died in 1749 A.D. (1162 A.H.). Other portions of the History were translated into French, of which the following may be cited: *Histoire de Benou Zayan*, translated by Dozy; and *Histoire des Benou al-Ahmar Rois de Grenade*, translated by G. Demombynes, both published in the 'Journal Asiatique'; and a larger portion about Banu Abd al-Wad was translated by A. Bel, and published in Algiers in three volumes under the title: *Histoire des Beni Abdel-Wad Rois de Telemcan.*

Some portions were translated into German, of

which the following may be cited: *Die Geschichte der Oqailiden Dynastie*, translated by Tiesenhausen; and some chapters about the occupation of the crusaders of the Syrian coasts *Geschichte der Franken, welche die Kusten und Grenzlaender Syriens besetzten* translated by Tornberg; and some chapters of the Prolegomena and History translated by Von Hammer and Von Kremer. A German translation of Ibn Khaldun's theories on the state appeared recently with commentaries by Edwin Rosenthal under the title: *Die Gedanken Ibn Khaldoun's uber den Staat.*

Some parts of the Prolegomena were translated into Italian by Lanci; and Amari translated the part concerning the history of Sicily and the part concerning the history of Yemen was translated into English by H. Cassels Kay; and some chapters of the Prolegomena were translated by Prof. Flint. Some other parts were also translated into Latin, Russian and other languages.

III

There are manuscript copies of the Prolegomena in Berlin, Leyden, Florence, Leningrad, the British Museum, Milan, Munich, Paris and Vienna. There are manuscripts of the whole work, either complete,

or lacking some parts, in the Egyptian Library (where there are two copies nearly complete, and some isolated volumes), Al-Azhar Mosque, in Osmaniah, Jeni Jami, and Ibrahim Pasha's collections at Constantinople, in the Quaruiyin Mosque at Fez, the British Museum, Oxford, Turin, Tubingen, Tunis and Algiers.* Lastly there is in the Egyptian Library (Mustapha Pasha Collection) a complete and as far as we know a unique copy of Ibn Khaldun's autobiography (*Al-Rihla al-Taarif*); it was afterwards copied for some other libraries and collections

* These copies are all described in detail in the Catalogues of these Libraries.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Arabic

Ibn Khaldun . Kitab al-Ibar (Bulak).
Al-Taarif bi Ibn Khaldun wa Rihlatuhu Sharqan wa Gharban (Ms., Cairo Library).
Muqaddimat Ibn Khaldun (Prolegomena); Quatremere's edition, (Paris 1858).
Muqaddimat Ibn Khaldun (Cairo, 1274 A.H.)

Ibn al-Khatib : Al-Lamhat al-Badria fi Tarikh al-Dawlati al-Nasriah.

Al-Makkari . Naf h al-Tib min Ghusn al-Andalus al-Ratib.

Ibn Hajar : Ruf al-Isr un Kudat Misr (Ms. Cairo).
Inba al-Ghumr fi Anba al-Umr (Ms. Cairo).

Ibn Taghri Birdi (Abul Mahasin) : Al-Manhal al-Safi (Ms. Cairo)

Al-Sakhawi Al-Dawu al-Lami fi Ayan al-Qarn al-Tasi (Ms. Cairo).
Al-Ilan bil-Tawbikh.

Al-Makrizi Al-Suluk fi Dowal al-Muluk (Ms. Cairo).
Al-Khitat (Bulak).
Ighathat al-Umma bi-Kashf al-Ghumma (Ms. and the recent Cairo edition)

Ibn Arabshah : Ajaib al-Makdur.

Al-Suyuti : Husn al-Mahadara.

Al-Mawardi : Al-Ahkam al-Sultaniyah.
Qawanin al-Wizara.

Ibn al-Tıqtaqa : Al-Fakhri fil Adab al-Sultaniyah wal Dowal al-Islamiyah, (Greifswald 1858).
Al-Turtushı . Siraj al-Muluk (includıng Al-Ghazalı's "Al-Tibr al-Masbuk")
Abd al-Rahman ıbn Muhammad : Al-Manhaj al-Masluk fi Sayasat al-Muluk.
Ibn Kutayba : Uyun al-Akhbar.
Rasayıl Ikhwan al-Safa
Al-Farabı : Ara ahl al-Madına al-Fadıla.
Al-Qalqashandi Subh al-Aasha.
Enan, M.A . Mısr al-Islamıyah.

II. European

Von Hammer-Purgstall Ueber den Verfall des Islams nach den ersten drey Jahrhunderten der Hıdschart (1812).
A Von Kremer Ibn Chaldun und seıne Kulturgeschıchte der ıslamıschen Reıche, (Wıen 1879)
L Gumplowıcz Ibn Khaldun, eın arabıscher Sozıologe des 14 , Jahrhunderts ; ın Sociologısche Essays
T J. de Boer · Ibn Chaldun ; ın Geschıchte der Phılosophıe ım Islam, pp 177-84, (Stuttgart 1901).
Lewıne · Ibn Chaldun, ein arabıscher Sozıologe des XIV, Jahrhunderts
Von Wesendonk Ibn Khaldun, ein arabıscher Kulturhıstoriker des XIV , Jahrhunderts (Deutsche Rundschau, Januar 1923).
Muller . Der Islam, II, p. 668 ff
Brockelmann Geschichte der arabıschen Lıtteratur ; II, p. 243 ff.
Wuestenfeld : Geschıchtesc hreiber der Araber No. 456.

Rosenthal: Ibn Khalduns Gedanken uber den Staat, (Munchen 1932).

* * *

Encyclop. de l'Islam: art. Ibn Khaldoun par Alfred Bel.
Biographie Universelle t. XX, art. Ibn Khaldoun par S. de Sacy.

Schulz: Ibn Khaldoun, (art. au Journal Asiatique 1825).

Reinaud: Ibn Khaldoun; dans Nouvelle Biographie Generale (1858).

De Slane: Les Prolegomenes d'Ibn Khaldoun.

S. Colosio: Contribution a l'etude d'Ibn Khaldoun, (Revue du monde musulman XXVI, 1914).

Rene Maunier: Les idees economiques d'un philosophe arabe, (Revue d'histoire economique et sociale, 1912)

R. Maunier: Les idees sociologiques d'un philosophe arabe au XIVeme siecle, (l'Egypte contemporaine, 1917, p. 31)

Taha Hussein: La philosophie sociale d'Ibn Khaldoun. (Arabic version by M.A. Enan)

* * *

Graberg de Hemsoe: Account of the great historical work of the African philosopher Ibn Khaldoun. (Transactions of the A.R.S. 1833).

R. Flint: Historical philosophy, p. 157 ff. (Edinburgh 1893).

N. Schmidt: Ibn Khaldun Historian, Sociologist and Philosopher, (New York 1930)

* * *

Ferreiro: un sociologo arabo del secolo XIV, (La Riforma Sociale anno III, Vol. VI, Fasc 4., 1886).

N. Machiavelli · The Prince.
Florentine History.

Aristotle. Politics

Dozy: Recherches sur l'Histoire et la Litterature d'Espagı au moyen age

INDEX